THREE HISTORIANS OF THE DELHI SULTANATE

by

© Saleem Kidwai

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
and Research, McGill University, Montréal,
in partial fulfillment of the
requirement for the degree
of Master of Arts

Institute of Islamic Studies
McGill University
Montréal

October 1980

ABSTRACT

TITLE: THREE HISTORIANS OF THE DELHI SULTANATE

AUTHOR: Saleem Kidwai

DEPARTMENT: Institute of Islamic Studies

DEGREE: Master of Arts

The histories of Minhāj, Baranī and ʿAfīf provide most of the information available to us about the political history of the sultanate of Delhi for the period 1206-1398. These works, however, must be viewed within the context of the administrative and social positions held by each man. All three were members of the ruling class in the larger sense of the term and their histories clearly reflect the interests and concerns of this class rather than of the society in general. In addition, their biases which were based on personal preoccupations defined the contents and nature of their histories. The work of these three historians, viewed against this background, will enrich our knowledge of the age.

RÉSUMÉ

TITRE: TROIS HISTORIENS DU SULTANAT DE DELHI

AUTEUR: Saleem Kidwai

DEPARTEMENT: Institut d'Etudes Islamiques
(Institute of Islamic Studies)

DIPLOME: Maîtrise en Arts

Les écrits historiques de Minhāj, Baranī et 'Afīf nous fournissent la plus grande parte de l'information disponible pour l'étude de l'histoire politique du sultanat de Delhi pour la période 1206-1398. Toutefois ces travaux doivent être considérés dans le cadre des fonctions administratives et sociales de chacun des historiens. Tous les trois étaint issus de la classe dirigeante, au sens large du mot, et leurs travaux reflêtent les intérêts et préoccupations de cette classe plutôt que ceux de l'ensemble de la société. De plus, les préjugés de chacun relevant de sa situation individuelle, definit le contenu et la nature de ses travaux. Considérés sur cette toile de fond, les écrits de chacun de ces trois auteurs doivent enrichir notre connaissance de la période.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to gratefully acknowledge my indebtedness to the following:

Dr. Charles J. Adams, my supervisor and the Director of the Institute of Islamic Studies for all his help and advice, not only in the writing of this thesis, but in every other matter that I took to him. Extremely generous with his time, he helped me at my convenience rather than his own. I am extremely grateful to him for his patience and his faith in me and would therefore like to extend to him my apologies for the shortcomings of this work.

Dr. Sajida Alvi, now at the University of Minnesota, for her help in formulating the proposal for this thesis. I will always regret her leaving the Institute and am sure that this work would have been much better had I been able to avail of her knowledge of medieval Indian sources.

Dr. A. Uner Turgay for his advice and friendship during the time that I have spent at the Institute. Professor Hermann Landolt for teaching me most of the Persian that I know and for helping me with the translation of the Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī.

Dr. Peter Hardy of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, for his willingness to help and for his suggestions during the research of this thesis.

To Ms. Christine Korah and Ms. Joan Naylor, Administrative Assistants at the Institute, for their friendship and help, always ungrudgingly extended.

To Ms. Salwa Ferahian, Assistant Librarian for running one of the best libraries of the world.

My teachers at the University of Delhi, particularly Dr. David Baker of St. Stephens College and Dr. Suhash Chakravarthi of the Department of History. My former students at Ramjas College, and at the Department of History, for teaching me more and making me work harder than my teachers ever could.

To my friends in Montréal, particularly Deborah Pugh, Huda Lutfi, Jennifer Darling and Maqbool Spencer for making Montréal warm the year round. Special thanks to Jennifer Darling for going out of her way to type this thesis in spite of her other preoccupations and distractions.

And most of all to my family, Sadiq, Azra, Hafsa, Sofia and Paul whose sacrifices and support made it possible for me to spend time at McGill.

PREFATORY NOTE

The system of transliteration used in this thesis is based on the Arabic system provided in the Transliteration Table of the Institute of Islamic Studies (See Appendix B). For the sake of uniformity the Arabic rather than the Persian, has been followed throughout. For letters not in the Persian or Arabic alphabet, the Urdu system has been used. For Sanskrit names, the system used in the Department of Religious Studies, McGill University has been followed. Well known place names have not been traslit-erated and other common words such as sultan have not been treated as foreign words. Plurals, except for the widely current ones such as ʿulamāʾ, have been made by adding 's' to the Arabic or Persian singulars, the 's' not being underlined. Some other liberties have been taken for the sake of uniformity of transliteration. In place of the Persian ke, ki has been used and constructions such as Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī are spelt with a simple iḍāfah instead of as Fatāwā-yi Jahāndārī.

When two dates are given, the first one is according to the Muslim calendar. For converting dates from the Muslim into the Christian calendar the conversion system as given by G. S. P. Freeman-Grenville, The Muslim and Christian Calendars (London: Oxford University Press, 1963) has been followed.

The bibliography includes only those sources which have been cited in the notes. Other material used in the preparartion of this work, but not included in the references, does not appear in the bibliography. The abbreviation EI² stands for the second edition of the Encyclopedia of Islam.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The decision of the Royal Asiatic Society in the middle of the nineteenth century to publish historical texts relating to the history of India was to have far-reaching effects on historical scholarship in India, effects that are still with us today. Beginning in the early 1860's, under the supervision of Major W. Nassau Lees, a new series of Persian texts appeared in the Bibliotheca Indica series, a series which until then had concentrated first on Sanskrit and then on Arabic texts. The availibility of medieval texts in printed form was to influence the later works on the history of medieval India.

The history of the sultanate of Delhi continues to be written primarily from literary sources, though the size of the material consulted has continued to grow, expanding to include published and unpublished works of both religious and political nature. This almost total dependence on literary sources is best illustrated in one of the more recent works on the period, A Comprehensive History of India.[1] This large undertaking, though ambitious and commendable, is again based almost solely on literary sources. One of the reasons for (and also one of the results of) this dependence is the failure of scholars of medieval Indian history to develop a methodology in which other sources such as architectural, archaeological or numismatic materials, to name the most obvious, can be used to supplement the literary sources. Another reason for this heavy reliance is the sheer pre-ponderance of literary sources over other types. The importance of the literary sources lies in their mass (though the amount of material available is still

far from what one would wish). One cannot ignore or get away from them, no matter how much one is aware of their inherent limitations.

For the history of the Delhi sultanate, the following are readily available: Kitāb al-Hind of al-Bīrūnī (ed. E. C. Sachau, London, 1887), Tabaqāt-i Nāsirī of Minhāj-i Sirāj Jūzjānī (eds. W. Nassau Lees, Khadim Hosain and ʻAbd al-Hai, Calcutta, 1864), Adāb al-Harb wa al-Shajaʻat of Fakhr-i Mudabbir (ed. Ahmad Suhaylī, Tehran, 1346/1927-28), the Rihlah of Ibn Battūtah (ed. Agha Mahdi Husain, Baroda, 1953), Amīr Khusraw's Duwal Rānī Khidr Khān (ed. Abdulghani Mirzāev, Dushanbe, Tajikistan, 1975), Khazā'in al-Futūh (ed. S. Moinul Haq, Aligarh, 1927, and M. Wahid Mirza, Calcutta, 1953), Nuh Sipihr (ed. M. Wahid Mirza, London, 1950), Qir'ān al-Saʻdayn (ed. Mawlwī Muhammad Ismāʻīl, Aligarh, 1918, and Tehran, 1297/1880), Tughlaq Nāmah (ed. Saiyid Hāshmī Farīdābādī, Aurangabad, 1939), the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī (ed. Saiyid Ahmad Khan, Calcutta, 1862), and Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī (ed. Afsar Salim Khan, Lahore, 1972) of Diyā' al-Dīn Baranī, Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq's Futūhāt-i Fīrūz Shāhī (Delhi, 1302/1884-85), the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī of Shams-i Sirāj ʻAfīf (ed. Maulvi Vilayat Husain, Calcutta, 1891), Futūh al-Salātīn of ʻAbd al-Malik ʻIsāmī (ed. Agha Mahdi Husain, Agra, 1938, and M. Usha, Madras, 1948), the Ta'rīkh-i Mubārak Shāh of Yahyā Sirhindī (ed. M. Hidayat Husain, Calcutta, 1931), Siyar al-Awliyā' of Sayyid Muhammad ibn Mubārak Kirmānī (Delhi, 1302/1884-85), Khayr al-Majālis compiled by Hamīd Qalandar (ed. Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, Aligarh, 1959), Fawāʻid al-Fuʻād of Amir Hasan Sijzī (ed. M. Latif Malik, Lahore, 1966).

This list, by no means comprehensive, gives one an idea of the variety of material available. The availability of this material,

though obviously a blessing, can often prove to be a disadvantage. Ready made histories, with their aura of being 'authentic' and 'contemporary', often dull the critical senses of scholars. The temptation to paraphrase existing histories and to transmute them into modern histories is easy and great. There can, ofcourse, be no excuse for shoddy scholarship, but the existence of a historical account, contemporary or near contemporary, is an invisible trap. The existing sources tend to pre-define the format of modern works. There is just one example in the chapter on Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq in the Comprehensive History of India.[2] Even an otherwise experienced historian such as Banarsi Prasad Saksena divides his chapters on lines almost identical with those of 'Afīf's history.

The first collection of major histories of the medieval period in one set of volumes began appearing in the 1860's. John Dowson, working on the posthumous papers of Henry M. Elliot put together The History of India as Told by its Own Historians in eight volumes.[3] Elliot was an important member of the Indian Civil Service and was appointed Foreign Secretary to the Government of India before he died. In 1849 he had published the first and fourth volumes of his Bibliographical Index to the Historians of Mohammedan India.[4] This consisted of tracts of texts and translations from manuscripts that he had collected. After Elliot's death, Dowson was entrusted with bringing out a more expansive version of the histories. In this version, the histories appeared only in translation.

The motivation for the tremendous labour that went into the preparation and presentation of this work, however, was not the enhancement of historical scholarship. Political manipulation of

public opinion for the benefit of British rule coloured and distorted the work and diminished its value. Elliot's original preface in the Bibliographical Index, which was also included in the first volume of The History of India, sets out in unequivocal terms what the editors of these volumes wanted to achieve from their endeavours. Habib has extensively commented on this Preface[5] and S. H. Hodivala[6] has very painstakingly pointed out all the inaccuracies in translations. There is a need, however, to restate the objections to Elliot and Dowson's work, not with the intention of adding to Habib's basic criticism of it but because of the subsequent publishing history of these volumes. The original edition, though still widely in circulation, is not always available. A new edition of the work has, however, been printed.[7] For some inexplicable reason, the new edition of The History of India does not contain the original preface of Elliot. Thus the users of this later edition are presented with translations of medieval texts which look totally innocent. By the removal of what was an explicit statement of intent by the editors, readers are not informed of the inherent dangers of using the texts which were originally put together to show the history of India, prior to the arrival of the East India Company, in as unfavourable a light as it could possibly be shown.

There is a reciprocal relationship between the historian and and the history that he writes (or in the case of Elliot and Dowson, perpetuates). Facts do not speak for themselves. They are made to speak by the historian who selects, arranges and presents them.[8] History for Elliot was utilitarian, i.e., it had to serve a purpose. Elliot illustrates this attitude clearly when he defends the official

neglect of historical buildings (in this case the sarāyas) with the argument that they were no longer useful.[9] And to what use did Elliot want to put his history? Convinced of the Britishers' 'high destiny as rulers of India,'[10] Elliot wanted to make the "Native subjects more sensible of the immense advantages accruing to them under the mildness and equity of our rule".[11] He realised that this was difficult under conditions which tended to "preclude all natural symapathy between sovereign and subject."[12]

Convincing the 'native subjects' of the benefits of British rule necessitated a vivid presentation of the 'dark ages' from which the East India Company had rescued them. And this dark age was the period when India was subjected to the tyranny of 'Mohammadan' rulers. The need that the Company and the British officials felt for convincing their 'native subjects' of the degeneration and tyranny inherent in 'Mohammadan' rule was pressing. One of the main hindrances in the way of the territorial expansion of the Company was the state of Awadh still ruled by Muslims. The connection between Elliot's endeavours and the eventual annexation of Awadh needs to be investigated.[13] One is tempted to believe that Elliot had Awadh in mind when he wanted his readers to turn their

> eyes to the present Muhammadan kingdoms of India, and examine the character of princes, and the condition of the people subject to their sway, we may fairly draw a parallel between ancient and modern times under circumstances and relations nearly similar. We behold kings, even of our own creation, sunk in sloth and debauchery and emulating the vices of a Caligula or a Commodus. (14)

The fear that for the Indians, Muslim rule was preferable to the rule of the Company was real. It was proved by one of the first acts of the

mutineers in 1857 who proclaimed the inconsequential Mughal ruler as the Emperor of India.

The need to destroy this preference for Muslim rule was essential if the 'native subjects' were to be convinced to stop fretting and accept that "a more stirring and eventful era of India's History"[15] had commenced. To do this it was imperative that the Muslim rule be "set forth in a truer light, and probably be held up to the execration of Mankind"[16] so that the 'bombastic Bābūs' would stop complaining about the rule of the British. Elliot therefore set about devoting a major part of his efforts to collecting and translating histories of a country "where fairy tales and fictions are included under the general name of history".[17] Elliot's total lack of sympathy for the subject to which he devoted himself with such admirable enthusiasm immediately makes his endeavours suspect. He tells us that these histories have no 'intrinsic value' in themselves. The general nature of the histories was summarised by him as:

> without a general reflection or suggestion which is not of the most puerile and contemptible kind; and without any observations calculated to interrupt the monotony of successive conspiracies, revolts, intrigues, murders, and fratricides, so common in Asiatic monarchies, and to which India unhappily forms no exception. (18)

Having pre-judged these histories, Elliot and Dowson set about doctoring the texts to fit into the pattern that Elliot had conceived for them. Whenever any observations interrupted the monotony of revolts, conspiracies, intrigue or murders, Elliot (and later Dowson) edit them out. Therefore, depending on their version of Baranī's Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī, we would learn nothing of 'Alā' al-Dīn Khaljī or Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughlaq's revenue arrangements. All portions of 'Afīf's history which

do not fit into Elliot's description of the histories were similarily omitted. Examples of such motivated editing can be multiplied endlessly.

The work of Elliot and Dowson has had tremendous consequences. Generation after generation of scholars went to their work for easy access to the sources.[19] The knowledge of the languages in which these sources were written became almost unimportant. The later historians deprived of a knowledge of the sources in their original forms, assimilated the preconceived biases of the editors. A study of works of history which have relied of Elliot and Dowson's work for their material would be extremely interesting and instructive. Such a study could document how far Elliot and Dowson's prejudices have been unconsciously carried over into modern historiography of medieval Indian history. This is not the place, however, to examine the harmful effects of Elliot and Dowson's work in detail. An example concerning one aspect of medieval Indian history will, however, be examined.

Elliot was particularly concerned with instructing the Hindu 'race' about how much better off they were under the British than under Muslim rulers. He informs us that the histories that he had collected tell us of

> ....Hindus slain for disputing with Muhammadans, of general prohibitions against processions, worship, and ablutions and of idols mutilated, of temples razed, of forcible conversions and marriages, of prescriptions and confiscations, of murders and massacres, and of the sensuality and drunkeness of the tyrants who enjoined them. (20)

If we are to believe Elliot, the Muslim rulers followed a policy bordering on the genocidal against their Hindu subjects. He is therefore surprised when Hindu writers do not back him up:

> there is not one of this slavish crew who treats the history of his native country subjectively, or presents us with the thoughts, emotions and raptures which a long oppressed race might be supposed to give vent to, when freed from the tyranny of its former masters, and allowed to express itself in the language of the heart without constraint and without adulation. (21)

Compare Elliot's views on the condition of Hindus under the Muslim rulers to those of a modern scholar. Majumdar in an essay on Hindu-Muslim relations during the period of the sultanate of Delhi talks of Hindus being denied their 'civil rights', and the 'right to public worship', of 'indignities and humilities (sic) inflicted upon them as a general policy', of 'acts of terrorism' against the 'hapless Hindus' and of the Hindus being the 'object of utter contempt', a feeling which 'animated all the Muslim conquerors and is echoed in all the Muslim chronicles'.[22] Majumdar, it must be pointed out, depends entirely on Elliot and Dowson's work for his knowledge of the 'chronicles' that he talks about. It is not being suggested that Elliot and Dowson are responsible for Majumdar's views on Indian history. But would it be too fanciful to conjecture that Majumdar's views might have been modified had he read the 'chronicles' from which he derives his information in their original form?

S. A. A. Rizvi has completed a similar project, of collecting, editing, and translating the major sources of medieval Indian history.[23] More accurate, and less distorted in its editing, the work, nonetheless, has not been properly valued and it has not gained the currency which should have been its legitimate due. The work is in Hindi, which for some unclear reason has hindered its use even by scholars who know the language. In the works by Indian scholars, one comes across far more

references to Elliot and Dowson's work than to Rizvi's work. The only reason that suggests itself to us is that the reputation of The History of India is still too well established for modern researchers to look elsewhere for the same material.

The literary sources for this period, particularly the more common ones, have now been easily available for more than a century in printed form. But the work of evaluating and analysing these sources has long been neglected. Habibullah and Mahdi Husain did survey articles dealing with the sources of the period.[24] Theirs was a commendable beginning, but it failed to set a trend. Individual historians, Baranī being the most popular, have been studied. Habib, Rashid, S. H. Barani, Nurul Hasan, Nizami, Lal, Haq, Hardy, etc. have all studied Baranī.[25] Minhāj has been studied rather perfunctorily by Mumtaz Moin.[26] Habib and Wahid Mirza have studied Amīr Khusraw,[27] Roy, the Futūhāt-i Fīrūz Shāhī,[28] and Riazul Islam the Sīrat-i Fīrūz Shāhī.[29] But no major attempt was made to study the major works in relation to each other till Hardy published his work in the historiography of the sultanate period.[30] Hardy's views on individual historians and on the trends of Muslim historiography during the period of the sultanate were provocative and unacceptable to quite a few historians who found that Hardy neglected the material forces in history by concentrating on intellectual trends. There was objection also to his emphasis on the religious thought of the historians he studied (Baranī, 'Afīf, Sirhindī, 'Isāmī and Amīr Khusraw). Hardy's work, however, has failed to provoke the reaction which such a competently argued and well written thesis should have evoked. No major work on the historiography of

the sultanate of Delhi has followed.[31]

At a seminar on medieval Indian historiography organised in Delhi in 1966, Nizami and Askari,[32] both of whom dealt with the historians included in Hardy's work, disagreed with Hardy, but only Nizami took issue with him over a major point. Only one other scholar has taken up the challenge thrown down by Hardy in a major way. Mukhia in his study of the historiography of Akbar's period has included a discussion of the historians of the sultanate of Delhi.[33] That this discussion was provoked by Hardy is proved not only by Mukhia's arguments, but also by the fact that Mukhia covers only the historians (with the addition of Minhāj) that Hardy had dealt with. The fact that Mukhia should discuss these historians of the sultanate as a background for his main work while ignoring the historiography of the reign of Bābur, Humāyūn and Sher Shāh Sūr proves that Hardy's work is the main inspiration behind the work. Though only meant as an introduction to the study of the historiography of a later period, Mukhia's work too raises important issues. Other works have been added to studies of the historiography of the period. Hardy has continued contributing articles on the subject.[34] Others have supplemented Habib's earlier works on Chisti records by studying other sūfī sources.[35] But much more remains to be done in this field.

Also, a lot more work has to be done to make the maximum use of the sources available to us. The various histories must be analysed separately but also studied in relation to one another. Such a study is necessary in order to find out what characteristics are general and therefore intrinsic in the works and which ones are peculiar. Knowledge of these

characteristics is fundamental to understanding the nature of these sources. Through a study of the sources in a larger framework the basic trends, tendencies and pre-occupations can emerge. Historiographical studies, apart from helping towards the writing of general histories,[36] are also a part of this general history. Through the study of these sources, the works of individual men, a contribution can be made towards reconstructing the intellectual history of the sultanate of Delhi. These sources have been the essential raw material with which nearly all history of the Delhi sultanate has been constructed, and it is imperative to come to terms with the nature of this raw material. Only by being familiar with its strengths and drawbacks can we know what to do with it and how to best utilise it.

This thesis is an attempt to study three historians of the sultanate period and their works. The three historians chosen are Minhāj, Baranī and ʻAfīf. A word must be said about the choice of the three. Three historians have only been chosen for study in order to limit the size of this work. These three (and any three could have been chosen) have been selected for one simple reason. They cover the history of the sultanate of Delhi in an uninterrupted way[37] from the time when Quṭb al-Dīn Aybak found himself independent upon the death of his master to the death of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq, following which Tīmūr's invasion destroyed the central authority of the sultanate. Both Baranī and ʻAfīf were conscious of this continuity. Baranī claims to have picked up the thread of history from where Minhāj had left it, and ʻAfīf claimed to have been completing the history left unfinished by Baranī.

The work of these historians will be studied in order to

pinpoint and trace the evolution of ideas and attitudes -- towards state and kingship, religion and politics, society and non-Muslims. Their political and social concerns and fears will be dealt with, and an attempt will be made to see how far they are reflective of their times.

In awareness that there is a direct relation between the historian and his history, the personal ambitions and predelictions of our three authors will be examined in order to place their histories in a better perspective. This is the only way in which the real nature of their histories can be understood; through this process their reliability or otherwise will also become clear. Such a study will help us understand why they say what they say. Their attitude towards history and their sources will be examined, and an attempt will be made to outline their methodology. Only by clarifying all this can their reliability and worth as sources be evaluated.

An explanation has to be given for dealing with these three historians in isolation from the larger 'Islamic context'. Our approach is not the reverse of what Hodgson has classified as the 'Arabistic bias' in the field of Islamic studies.[38] Placing and evaluating these three historians within an Indian rather than an 'Islamic' context is a deliberate attempt to study the evolution of historical writing in the sultanate of Delhi. There is no intention here to deny the larger, non-Indian roots of the consciousness of these historians. But this consciousness shows very definite signs of evolving away from its roots. Minhāj who was educated and whose consciousness was formed in the lands included in 'Islamdom' to use

Hodgson's phrase, shows a definite awareness of Islamic intellectual traditions and of the fact that the Muslims of his time were still linked to the Muslims outside India. He therefore attempted to write a history of the world from Adam onwards. However, it was in respect to his own period and situation that his main contribution lies. Baranī writing a century later, was conscious of the formal demands of history writing but only pays lip-service to them. As far as Baranī was concerned, his chief interest lay within the fluctuating borders of the Delhi sultanate. Baranī disapproved of the show of excessive courtesy to the envoys of the Caliph by Muḥammad ibn Tughlaq.[39] One may interpret his attitude as meaning that extra-territorial connections made no political sense to him. 'Afīf goes further and writes only about the sultanate of Delhi.[40] There is no denying that tracing the antecedents of medieval Indian historiography in Arabic and Persian works would be useful. But since these histories deal with India, we shall place them within a specifically Indian context in order to illuminate both the history and the historiography of this important region of the Islamic world.

NOTES

[1]Indian History Congress, A Comprehensive History of India, vol. 5: The Delhi Sultanate, eds. K. Mohammad Habib and Khaliq Ahmad Nizami (New Delhi: Peoples Publishing House, 1970). This work has been planned in twelve volumes but only vols. 1 and 5 have appeared to date.

[2]Banarsi Prasad Saksena, "Firuz Shah Tughlaq," Comprehensive History of India, vol. 5, pp. 566-619.

[3]Henry M. Elliot and John Dowson, The History of India as Told by its Own Historians, 8 vols. (London: Trübner & Co., 1866-77).

[4]Henry M. Elliot, Bibliographical Index to the Historians of India, vols. 1 and 4. (Calcutta: Thomas, 1849).

[5]Mohammad Habib, "An Introduction to the Study of Medieval India," Politics and Society in the Early Medieval Period, ed. Khaliq Ahmad Nizami (New Delhi: Peoples Publishing House, 1974), pp. 3-32.

[6]Shāhpūrshāh Homasjī Hodivālā, Studies in Indo-Muslim History; A Critical Commentary on Elliot and Dowson's History of India as Told by its Own Historians, with a Foreward by Richard Burns (Bombay: S. H. Hodīvālā, 1939), Supplement, vol. 2 (Bombay: R. S. Hodīvālā, 1957). Vol. 2 has imprint, Bombay, Distributors: Popular Book Depot.

[7](Calcutta: Susil Gupta, 1952-58). The reprint ed. of Bibliographical Index (Delhi: Idarah-i Adbiyat-i Delli, 1972) does include the original preface, but since this older work was superceeded by History of India, the argument being made stands.

[8]For a lucid exposition of the historical methodology on this point see Chapter I of E. H. Carr, What is History? (London: Macmillan, 1961, reprint ed. Pelican Books, 1976).

[9]Elliot and Dowson, History of India, vol. 1, p. xxiii.

[10]Ibid., p. xxvii.

[11]Ibid., p. xxii.

[12]Ibid., p. xxvii.

[13]Elliot's first volume of the Bibliographical Index was published

a year after the annexation of Awadh.

[14]Elliot and Dowson, History of India, vol. 1, p. xx.

[15]Ibid., p. xvi.

[16]Ibid., p. xxii.

[17]Ibid., p. xviii.

[18]Ibid., p. xix.

[19]The Elliot and Dowson volumes are described by one major scholar of medieval Indian history as "indispensable for the researcher of medieval history." The same scholar goes on to say: "But no research worker on medieval Indian history could help reading or rereading Elliot's work", Kishori Saran Lal, Studies in Medieval Indian History (Delhi: Ranjit Printers and Publishers, 1966), pp. 83, 84.

[20]Elliot and Dowson, History of India, vol. 1, p. xxi.

[21]Ibid., p. xxii.

[22]R. C. Majumdar, gen. ed., The History and Culture of the Indian People, vol. 5: The Struggle for Empire (Bombay: Bhartiya Vidya Bhavan, 1957), pp. 497-502.

[23]Saiyid Athar Abbas Rizvi, A Source Book of Medieval Indian History in Hindi, 10 vols. (Aligarh: Department of History, Aligarh Muslim University, 1953-62).

[24]A. B. M. Habibullah, "Re-evaluation of the Literary Sources of Pre-Mughal History," Islamic Culture, 15 (1941): 207-16; and Agha Mahdi Husain, "A Critical Study of the Sources for the History of India (1320-1526)," Islamic Culture, 31 (1957): 314-21.

[25]Mohammad Habib and Afsar Umar Salim Khan, Political Theory of the Delhi Sultanate (Allahabad: Kitab Mahal, n.d.); Shaykh 'Abd al-Rashid, Khwājah Diyā' al-Millat al-Dīn Diyā' al-Dīn Barnī, trans. Muhammad 'Umar (Aligarh: Department of History, Aligarh Muslim University, 1957); S. Nural Hasan, "Sahifa-i-Na't-i-Muhammadi of Zia-ud-Din Barani," Medieval India Quarterly, 1, iii and iv (1950): 100-106; Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, "Zia-ud-Din Barani," Historians of Medieval India, ed. Muhibbul Hasan, with a Foreword by Muhammad Mujeeb (Meerut: Meenakshi Prakashan, 1968), pp. 37-52; Kishori Saran Lal, "Ziauddin Barani as an

Authority on the Khaljis," Studies in Medieval Indian History, pp. 100-109; Syed Moinul Haq, Barani's History of the Tughlaqs; Being a Critical Study of the Relevant Chapters of the Tārīkh i Fīrūz Shāhī (Karachi: Pakistan Historical Society, 1959); Peter Hardy, "Oratio-Recta of Baranī's Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī - Fact or Fiction?" Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, 20 (1950): 315-21.

[26]Mumtaz Moin, "Qaḍī Minhāj al Dīn Sīrāj Juzjānī," Journal of the Pakistan Historical Society, 15 (1967): 163-74.

[27]Mohammad Habib, "Hazrat Amir Khusrau of Delhi," Politics and Society in the Early Medieval Period, pp. 291-355; M. Wahid Mirza, The Life and Works of Amir Khusrau (Calcutta, 1935, reprint ed., Lahore: University of Panjab, 1962).

[28]Nirode Bhusan Roay, "Futuhat i Firuz Shahi," Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, ser. iii, 7 (1941): 61-89.

[29]Riazul Islam, "A Note on the Sirat-i Firūz Shah," Proceedings of the Pakistan History Conference, 2 (1952): 245-49.

[30]Peter Hardy, Historians of Medieval India; Studies in Indo-Muslim Historical Writing (Lodnon: Luzac & Co., 1960).

[31]A recent work by Jagadish Narayan Sarkar, History of History Writing in Medieval India (Calcutta: Ratna Prakashan, 1978) was not available to me. See review by R. Nath in Islamic Culture, 52 (1978): 131-33. It might be noted that in an earlier article, "Personal History of Some Medieval Historians and their Writing," Historians of Medieval India, ed. Muhibbul Hasan, pp. 165-97, Sarkar has relied very heavily on Elliot and Dowson's translations.

[32]Nizami, "Zia-ud-Din Barani"; Syed Hasan Askari, "Amir Khusrau as an Historian," Historians of Medieval India, ed. Muhibbul Hasan, pp. 22-36.

[33]Harbans Mukhia, Historians and Historiography during the Reign of Akhbar (New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., 1976).

[34]Peter Hardy, "Some Studies in Pre-Mughal Muslim Historiography," Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon, ed. C. H. Philips (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), pp. 115-27; "The Muslim Historians of the Delhi Sultanate: Is What they say really What they Mean?" Journal of the Asiatic Society of Pakistan, 9 (1964): 59-63; "The Treatment of Violence in Indo-Muslim Persian Writings on History and Polity," Paper presented at the Conference on Islam in South Asia, Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University, Montréal, 1978.

[35]Mohammad Habib, "Chisti Mystic Records cf the Sultanate Period," Society and Politics in the Early Medieval Period, pp. 385-433; Syed Hasan Askari, "Historical Value of the Sufi Hagiographical Works on the Sultanate Period," Journal of the Bihar Research Society, 52 (1966): 143-84; Mohammad Saleem Akhter, "A Critical Appraisal of Sufi Hagiographical Corpus of Medieval India," Islamic Culture, 52 (1978): 139-50.

[36]By general history I mean history encompassing all aspects of human life and society: political, social, economic, cultural and religious.

[37]Barring the last six years of Nāṣir al-Dīn's reign.

[38]Marshall G. S. Hodgson, "The Unity of the Later Islamic History," Journal of World History, 5 (1960): 80.

[39]Diyā' al-Dīn Baranī, Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī, ed. Saiyid Ahmad Khan, Bibliotheca Indica Series (Calcutta: Asiatic Societyof Bengal, 1862), pp. 492-96.

[40]This assumption is obviously based on the one work of 'Afīf available to use, his Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī. It is realised that this work was a part of a series of histories of the Tughlaq rulers. But it must be stressed that the history of 'Afīf is dealt with in this thesis as an independent work, standing complete by itself (as the preface and the contents show and in spite of the fact that no complete manuscript has survived) and not just as a part of one larger work.

CHAPTER I

MINHAJ-I SIRAJ JUZJANI

The importance of the Tabaqāt-i Nāsirī[1] of Minhāj-i Sirāj Jūzjānī[2] lies not only in its being the only continuous account of the Turkish conquest of northern India, but also in its being a chronicle of the consolidation of the power thus acquired. It also set the trend towards the maintenance of chronological continuity, if it did not set the tone, style and approach exhibited in the histories of Ḍiyā' al-Dīn Baranī[3] and Shams-i Sirāj 'Afīf.[4] The works of these three provide us with a continuous political history (with the exception of six years) of the sultanate from its inception down to the end of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq's reign (1388), that is till a decade before the sultanate was delivered a death blow by the armies of Tīmūr (1398).

Of the three, Minhāj was closest to the center of power and maintained his relation to power for the longest period of time.[5] His own involvement as a state functionary had its disadvantages which will be discussed later. But because of his closeness to political power and the high ecclesiastical offices that he held, his work is extremely important. He is a voice from within the ruling élite. He also provides a wealth of information regarding the various political events of the period and the personnel involved. No doubt he is selective and biased, but this in itself throws a great deal of light on the period and his rôle therein. Since his is the work of an acknowledged 'ālim, the Tabaqāt-i Nāsirī could be a good source for an attempt to define the role

that the 'ulamā' played in the establishment of the Turkish rule in India.

The Tabaqāt-i Nāṣirī was an ambitious undertaking. Minhāj set out to write an account of the maliks and sultans of Islam, both of 'Arab and of 'Ajam.[6] He began with Adam and brought the story upto the fourteenth year of the reign of Sulṭan Nāṣir al-Dīn to whom he dedicated his work. The rulers discussed are divided into twenty three ṭabaqahs;[7] the first four deal with the Prophets, Muḥammad, the Khulafā'-i Rāshidūn, the 'Umayyads and the 'Abbasids. He then condenses six dynasties that arose after the 'Abbasids into one ṭabaqah, each dynasty being dealt with in a separate sub-division. The rulers of Yaman are dealt with in the next ṭabaqah. From ṭabaqah seven onwards, each dynasty merits an individual ṭabaqah. Each ṭabaqah is sub-divided, these sub-divisions being based on individual reigns. When he comes to the reign of Nāṣir al-Dīn, the sub-chapter dealing with him is broken up into an annual chronicle of his reign. Minhāj devotes the twenty second ṭabaqah to a biography of twenty five nobles of the sultanate of Delhi. The last ṭabaqah deals with the Mongols where again the ṭabaqah is divided on the basis of individual reigns. Thus if the major part of his work falls within the framework of dynastic historiography, the part dealing with Nāṣir al-Dīn fits into the Annalistic form.[8]

Each ṭabaqah begins with the origins of each dynasty, and each sub-divisionsbegins with the accession of the ruler and ends along with his reign. Because of these dynastic-biographic division of Minhāj's history, there is a great deal of overlapping which often leads to confusion. The same event is mentioned a number of times, and very

often the details differ. The dates, too, do not always synchronise. This state of affairs also has its advantages. The differences in detail immediately warn us not to take them as they stand and inform us that they need to be cross-checked.

The *tabaqahs* become much more detailed by the time Minhāj reaches nearer to his own times. He gives a list of the names of the sons, nobles, *qādīs*, *wazīrs* and other *maliks* of Sultan Shams al-Dīn Iltutmish.[10] In his mention of the nobles, the largest notice is given to Ulugh Khān.

Minhāj's *Tabaqāt-i Nāsirī* can be placed in its proper perspective only when we analyse the role that the *'ulamā'* played in the foundation of the Delhi sultanate. Minhāj was one of the leading *'ulamā'* and also one of the leading functionaries of the administration. Nizami, one of the leading authorities of the religious history of the period, classifies Minhāj along with other *'ulamā'*, such as *shaykh al-Islām* Najm al-Dīn Sughrā, as among those *'ulamā'* who were so involved in things material that they had forgotten their religious duties.[11] He asserts elsewhere that 'Muslim public opinion' not only treated such *'ulamā'* with "contemptuous indifference but held them responsible for all the vices and misfortunes of the Muslim community".[12] In support of his argument he quotes the rather dubious views of Diyā' al-Dīn Baranī. Baranī classifies the *'ulamā'* into two categories: the *'ulamā'-i ākhirat* and the *'ulamā'-i dunyā*.[13] The former were those who were interested in learning and piety and who were not attracted by wealth or political affairs. The latter were those who had compromised themselves by agreeing to serve the state.[13] Baranī goes on to advise

the kings that they should entrust matters of state only to the former type of *'ulamā'*. Baranī, as we shall see in the next chapter, had failed, much to his own frustration, to do well at the court. His convoluted logic is obvious in this advice. If accepted, it would immediately reduce the first category to the position of the second. Also by the logic of the argument itself, the *'ulamā'-i ākhirat* would refuse to accept such responsibility. Baranī has indicated his own admiration for Minhāj by including him in the list of the leading *'ulamā'* of the preceeding period.[14] Giving the reasons why he would not cover the history of the period already covered by Minhāj, in his *Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī* Baranī says that if he contradicts anything said by Minhāj, people would consider it rude.[15] If this be true, to what 'Muslim public opinion' does Nizami refer? One would not basically argue with this simple sub-division of the *'ulamā'* but only with the underlying value judgements. Minhāj, as we shall see below was completely involved with politics and the state. Does this make him less of an *'ālim*? Or does it make him one of the *'ulamā'-i sū'* or a 'wicked mullah' in Azād's definition of the concept?[16]

One should discuss and argue about the role of the *'ulamā'* in the foundation of the sultanate in this context. Their historical role cannot be discussed on the basis of their piety but in terms of how their learning, and the social and political position acquired because of this learning, was used to bolster the position of the ruling elite. Minhāj and other of the *'ulamā'* like him had as much at stake in the fortunes of the empire as did any other *malik*. Minhāj's work has, therefore, to be seen as the work, not of a pious *'ālim* who was acquiring

knowledge for personal merit, but as that of a state functionary who chose to provide his services to the rulers in three vital fields in which his talents and learning were very useful. These were: propoganda, education, and the administration of justice. There are no 'ifs' in history. But even at the risk of sounding unhistorical, one could venture to assert that had affairs been left to the 'ulamā' who were interested only in personal or social moral salvation, the empire would not have been established in northern India.

We know very little about the religious heritage and roots of the tribes who came to India. But it is very likely that they were recent converts.[17] It is also likely that their conversion was motivated by very mundane considerations. For the leaders, religion was as much a matter of politics as it was of personal faith. Minhāj tells us that both Ghiyāth al-Dīn and Mū'izz al-Dīn of Ghur were followers of the Qaramathian sect; and that Mū'izz al-Dīn converted to the Hanafī faith when he realised that most of his subjects belonged to the Hanafī madhhab, making it politic for him also to do so.[18] The rulers of the sultanate of Delhi also had the same attitude, and they found allies in many 'ulamā'. These 'ulamā' adopted a very practical approach to matters. They did not raise embarassing questions for the rulers. Compromises were continually being made in the political and administrative fields, and the 'ulamā' learnt to do so in the religious field as well.

The Sultanate was not a theocracy as Tripathi[19] and Mahdi Husain[20] have implied. Had the political affairs of the empire been run according to strict Islamic dictates, the empire would not have been established, let alone have survived. The Muslims in India were

grossly outnumbered by the non-Muslim population. In India Muslim rulers ruled over the largest percentage of non-Muslim population known in the political history of Islam.[21] One cannot here go into the history of the relationship between religion and political pragmatism that had been worked out by Muslim rulers elsewhere. What needs to be stressed is that no matter what equation had been worked out outside of India it did not necessarily apply to India. No matter what traditions the invaders came with, the success of the Turks in establishing themselves in India presumes that compromises must have been made.

The Sultans of Delhi adopted a very pragmatic approach towards religion and its enforcement. This is best illustrated in an incident related by Baranī. We have no proof of its authenticity, but it could very well have been true. He relates that some of the leading <u>'ulamā'</u> of Delhi went to Sultan Iltutmish and argued that since the Hindus were 'the worst enemies of the Prophet' they should be given the choice between Islam and death. Iltutmish referred the matter to his <u>wazīr</u> Niẓām al-Dīn Junaydī whose answer exemplified the basic attitude of the rulers of the sultanate. Pacifying the <u>'ulamā'</u> by accepting their view that "there is no doubt that the Hindus should be given the choice of death or Islam since they are the worst enemies of the Prophet's religion", he reminded them how impractical such a solution would be:

> But at the moment India has newly been conquered, and the Muslims are so few that they are like salt (in a dish). If the above orders are applied to the Hindus, it is possible that they might combine, and general confusion might ensue, and the Muslim would be too few in number to suppress this general confusion. (22)

The Sultans drew a distinct line between their personal faith and their functions as rulers. Their attitude was essentially an

exercise in political realism. Their toleration of the non-Muslims and their failure to stick to the letter of the sharī'ah came about not because of any personal convictions but because of sheer necessity.[23] Shihāb al-Dīn continued the figure of the Hindu goddess Lakśmī on his coins,[24] and the coins of Quṭb al-Dīn Aybak displayed a bull on them.[25] Perpetuating a distinctly un-Islamic practice was not as important as the necessity to have a coinage which was accepted by most of their subjects.

This is not to imply that the Sultans ignored their own religion. They could not have done so because their soldiery and the ruling élite were still Muslims. Quṭb al-Dīn patronised the learned men of his time.[26] Iltutmish also showed great deference towards them.[27] He welcomed the 'ulamā' fleeing from the Mongols[28] and is known to have been very religious in his personal life.[29] Minhāj would deliver private religious discourses to him.[30] The Sultans must have realised the potency of religious symbolism.[31] They made an overt show of their respect for symbols of Islam such as the khuṭbah and the recognition of their claims by the Caliph.[32] They never interfered with the personal law of the Muslims.[33] Their common belief in Islam was the basic emotional bond between the sultans and their supporters. Their patronage of the 'ulamā' was necessary because without the prestige of a royal heritage behind them, they needed the sanction of the 'ulamā' to add to their prestige. The 'ulamā' also fulfilled some important functions such as administration of justice, education, and especially during the early period of the sultanate, of propaganda. They were, for all practical purposes, employees of the state. Obviously one is here talking of those 'ulamā' who had accepted

to become a part of the political set-up. And it appears that quite a large proportion, or the ones with better minds, opted for these materialistic pursuits. Aziz Ahmad points out that: "In theological studies, the contribution of India, compared with that of other countries of Dār al-Islam, was meagre and of regional rather than universal importance."[34]

For the 'ulamā', there were many openings in the administration. They could be appointed as qādīs, shaykh al-Islām, mustawfī-i mamālik, Imāms, khātibs, muftīs, etc.[35] And the state succeeded in attracting some of the better known 'ulamā' to serve it. An example is that of Najm al-Dīn Ṣughrā, a disciple of the 'Irāqī saint 'Uthmān Hārūnī, who was appointed shaykh al-Islām by Iltutmish.[36]

The importance of education had been realised by the conquerors right from the very beginning. We know from Minhāj that the madrasah-i Fīrūzī was already in existence in Uchch when he arrived there in 1227.[37] Minhāj is also our authority for the existence of two other madrasahs, the Nasiriyah[38] and the Mu'izzī[39] in Delhi. The former, as Day points out, was most likely built in the reign of Iltutmish.[40] The sultans supported the madrasahs and the mosques through awqāf.[41] In this way, both public opinion and education was controlled by men paid by the state. Qureshi, however, asserts that the 'ulamā' were free from political pressure and cites examples of some of the 'ulamā''s 'sturdy independence'.[42] But one can safely presume that these examples of independence were far outnumbered by examples of the 'ulamā''s acquiesence. How else can one explain their failure to challenge the accession of Radiyyah on legal grounds? It was left to a seventeenth century theolo-

gian, ʻAbd al-Ḥaqq Dihlavī, to express his surprise at how the jurists had supported such a flagrant violation of the conditions of the Imāmat.[43]

It speaks highly of the political acumen of the ʻulamā' that they agreed to bolster the position of the state by not raising embarrassing issues and creating more problems for the ruling élite which was already in a perilious situation -- facing constant pressure from the Mongols while having to deal with indigenous resistance from native rulers. They agreed tacitly to use their position to strengthen the incipient institutions. As teachers they advocated obedience to the sultan and political authority.[44] They also were employed as agents of propaganda. The best example is that of Minhāj himself who was called upon to bolster the morale of soldiers trying to reduce an important and defiant fortress. Minhāj had accompanied Iltutmish on his expedition to Gwalior and had delivered numerous tadhkīrs (religious sermons) to the troops.[45] He was called upon once again to calm the panic-stricken population of the capital when the news of the Mongol attack on Lahore reached there.[46] The ʻulamā's status as respected men of learning was also used to maintain domestic peace. Minhāj, along with several other learned men tried to mediate with the rebels who had challenged Sultan Bahrām Shāh.[47]

By being inducted into the administrative machinery of the state, the ʻulamā' played the same role as that of the amīrs. Their prime motivation was the survival of the sultanate. Having a vested interest in the state, they could not have been interested in weakening it. But over a period of time, with the empire taking roots, they developed their

own vested interests and started to use their power for their own peculiar purposes. They were aware of their power as we can see from their insistence on confirming whether or not Iltutmish had been manumitted before he became sultan.[48] As the chief members of the judiciary and because of the economic benefits that went with this function[49] they slowly strenthened their position. By the time of Bahrām Shāh they were beginning to entrench themselves with the ruling élite through matrimonial relations with royalty.[50] We also find the 'ulamā' developing an almost feudal claim to power. Minhāj mentions the incident in 1285 when after shayhk al-Islām Jamāl al-Dīn, a qādī and an Imām had died, their sons were appointed to succeed them.[51] This custom of succession to office in the family is also borne out by the subequent history of Minhāj's family. His grandson, Qādī Ṣadr al-Dīn 'Ārif became the Qādī-i mamālik of 'Alā'al-Dīn and later became ṣadr-i jahān.[52] Ṣadr al-Dīn 'Ārif was also married to the daughter of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughlaq.[53]

Minhāj-i Sirāj Jūzjānī was one 'ālim who had decided to make a career in the service of the state, and his career might be typical of many men of learning. Born most probably in 1193,[54] he came from a well to do and learned family. He traced his genealogy back to the royal family of Ghaznah.[55] His father was appointed qādī-i lashkar attached to the forces in Lahore by Sultan Mu'izz al-Dīn Muhammad ibn Sām in 1186-87. His mother was a close companion of Princess Māh-i Mulk, the daughter of Mu'izz al-Dīn. A very pious lady who had memorised the Qur'ān, and who was well-versed in hadīth, she brought Minhāj up in the royal haram.[56]

Minhāj was known to have been a good orator, and the first reference we have to his career occurs when he gave religious discourses

near Sīstān in 1216-17 and was liberally rewarded for them. We then hear of him being involved in the defence of the fortress of Tūlak when it was beseiged by the Mongols for eight months.[58] In 1224 he was, he claims, entrusted by Malik Tāj al-Dīn Ḥasan-i Salār Khān Pūst to open the caravan routes to Isfizān and Qahistān, which had been disrupted by the Mongols.[59] In 1226-27 he was asked by Malik Tāj al-Dīn Yanaltigīn, the ruler of Sīstān to negotiate peace terms with the Mulāḥidah at whose hands the former had suffered defeat.[60]

Minhāj, like many others, looked forward to migrating to India, a haven for many other refugees fleeing the devastation caused by the Mongols. He reached Uchch in Sindh in 1227.[61] Naṣīr al-Dīn Qubāchah who was then in control of the area appointed him to the Madrasah-i Firūzī, one of the earliest educational institutions established by the Muslims in India and also as qāḍī of his son 'Alā' al-Dīn Bahrām Shāh's forces.[62] When Iltutmish's forces confronted Qubāchah in the power struggle that followed Quṭb al-Dīn Aybak's death, Minhāj immediately established contact with Iltutmish. He met Tāj al-Dīn Kazlak Khān, a malik accompanying Iltutmish.[63] He was presented to Iltutmish and accompanied the royal forces back to Delhi.[64] This sort of opportunism and an uncanny ability to choose the winning side characterised Minhāj's career in Delhi. It also kept him, barring a small interlude, close to the center of power.

In 1231 Minhāj accompanied Iltutmish on his expedition against the Parihara ruler of Gwalior.[65] The seige lasted for eleven months, and Minhāj was called upon to deliver morale-boosting tadhkirs to the troops.[66] When the fortress was occupied, he was appointed the qāḍī,

khāṭib and Imām of Gwalior.[67] This was his first royal appointment in the Sultanate. He returned to Delhi in 1237-38. He avoids giving any reason but mentions only that he and 'other persons of note' did so on Raḍiyyah's orders. In Delhi the Nāṣiriyyah madrasah was entrusted to him along with the qāḍī-ship of Gwalior.[68] When Raḍiyyah was overthrown, Minhāj was quick to swear loyalty to the new ruler, Sultan Mu'izz al-Dīn Bahrām Shāh and composed a qiṭ'ah in his honour, proclaiming him as a 'second Iltutmish'.[69] When the news of the Mongol attack on Lahore reached Delhi, Minhāj, by royal command, gave a discourse to pacify the people who 'pledged their loyalty (anew) to the Sultan'.[70] Within a few months he was appointed as the qāḍī of the capital and also as the qāḍī al-quḍāt of the realm.[71] When there was an insurrection against Bahrām Shāh, Minhāj tried to interecede. He did not succeed and had obviously identified himself with the other side because an unsuccessful assassination attempt was made on his life. Bahrām Shāh was then assassinated and replaced by 'Alā' al-Dīn Mas'ūd Shāh.[72]

Minhāj resigned his job and left Delhi. Either he found it difficult to co-exist with the new clique that had come to power, or he foresaw a dim future for the sultanate which had seen the violent end to three rulers within the course of six years. He proceeded towards Lakhnawtī. The three years that he spentin Lakhnawtī were the only ones that he had spent away from Delhi since his return from Gwalior. Ṭūghān Khān Ṭughril, the muqta' of Lakhnawtī, received him with favour. Minhāj accompanied Ṭughān Khān Ṭughril on his expedition to Jājnagar. 'Alā' al-Dīn Mas'ūd Shāh was displeased with the ambitions that Ṭughān Khān had shown, and he sent Tamar Khān to replace him. In 1245, Minhāj

returned to Delhi where he ingratiated himself with the future Ulugh Khān. He was reappointed to the Nāṣiriyyah college, made supervisor of its endowments, and also appointed the qāḍī of Gwalior.[73]

With the accession of Sultan Nāṣir al-Dīn, and the accompanying ascendancy of Ulugh Khān, Minhāj was reappointed as the qāḍī al-quḍāt in 1251.[74] He lost his position temporarily when Ulugh Khān lost power to ʿImād al-Dīn Rayhān.[75] When Ulugh Khān was reinstated in royal favour, Minhāj too came back. In 1254, he was given the title of Ṣadr-i Jahān,[76] and the next year he was appointed the qāḍī of Delhi and once again as the qāḍī al-quḍāt.[77] We know next to nothing about his last years. He most probably continued in power till 1260 when he brought his chronicle of Nāṣir al-Dīn's reign to an end. He is supposed to have lived into the reign of Balban. Habibullah insists that Minhāj died before Nāṣir al-Dīn.[78] This view is not correct because Baranī mentions Minhāj in the list of ʿulamā' of the reign of Balban.[79] Why then did he stop writing in the middle of the reign of Nāṣir al-Dīn? Raverty suggests that he stopped his history in the fourteenth year of Nāṣir al-Dīn's reign because "not being able to chronicle victories, he refrained from continuing his history".[80] Raverty also takes into account the theory that the breaking off of the history was done to avoid writing about the alleged murder of the Sultan by Ulugh Khān. This view has been examined by Nizami who feels that Minhāj's silence is indicative of there being something to hide.[82] But the evidence available is inconclusive. One would tend to agree with Habibullah that Ulugh Khān had little to gain by murdering the Sultan when for all practical purposes he had accumulated all power in his hands.[82] The most obvious

explanation for Minhāj stopping his work when he did is his age. He would have been sixty-seven years old in 1260. Raverty does not think health was a factor because Minhāj continued in Balban's employment.[83] But there is a clear indication of Minhāj's declining health. In 1260, when the envoys of Hulāgū were received in a magnificent ceremony by Sultan Nāṣir al-Dīn, this once great orator had to depend on one of his sons to read a poem that he had written in commemoration of the event.[84] And since his own expressed desire was that 'royal grace may shine upon this frail one',[85] he might have wanted to enjoy the fruits of his labour.[86] There is also the suggestion that he fell into disfavour with Balban who is credited with some uncharitable remarks about him in a thirteenth century ṣūfī source, the Sarūr al-Ṣadr. Balban is supposed to have said:

> I have three qāḍīs; one of them does not fear me but does fear God; the other one does not fear God but fears me; the third one neither fears me nor God .... Fakhr Naqīla fears me but does not fear God; the qāḍī-i lashkar fears God but does not fear me. Minhāj neither fears me nor God. (87)

Knowing Minhāj's capabilities of staying on the right side of power, it is unlikely that he would have displeased someone whom he had endeavoured so hard to flatter in his book. It is also unlikely that Balban would have tolerated someone of whom he had such an opinion. We know too much of Balban's ruthlessness to think otherwise.

A later authority, the Tadhkirah-i Subh Gulshan gives the year of Minhāj's death as 1274.[88] But the source for this information has not been mentioned. What is likely is that having completed his book in Nāṣir al-Dīn's reign, Minhāj lived on into the reign of Balban. Elliot and Dowson's suggestion that the Tabaqāt-i Nāṣirī was written during

the reign of Balban is not tenable.[89] Minhāj refers to Balban only as Ulugh Khān and not as Ghiyāth al-Dīn Balban, the name that the latter adopted when he ascended the throne. Also, if the book had been written in the reign of Balban, what would have stopped Minhāj from dedicating it to him? After all, the section dealing with him is longer than the one dealing with Nāṣir al-Dīn to whom the book is dedicated.

Minhāj says that he completed his book on the fifth day of Rabī' al-Awwal of 658 H. (17th February 1260).[90] This date seems probable if we consider that the last event he mentions in the reign of Nāṣir al-Dīn is placed on the thirteenth day of Safar of the same year (12th January 1260).[91] But in the conclusion of his account of Ulugh Khān, he mentions Shawwāl of 658 H. (September/October 1260).[92] In the course of his notices on the maliks, he twice mentions Rajab 658 H. (June/July 1260).[93] What, therefore, seems likely is that he had completed tabaqah twenty-one and presented it to Nāṣir al-Dīn in Rabī' al-Awwal of 658 H. He then must have added the tabaqah on the nobles to present it to Ulugh Khān before adding the last tabaqah and formally completing his work. The fact that he mentions at the end of his work what rewards he had received indicates that he was making additions after having presented the work to Nāṣir al-Dīn and Ulugh Khān.

To evaluate Minhāj as a historian we have to deal with the idea of what constituted a medieval 'historian'. Askari classifies Minhāj, along with Baranī and 'Afīf among others, as 'professional historians'.[94] The concept of a 'professional historian' is difficult to visualise for the period we are dealing with. Surely they earned money for writing history, as we know Minhāj did. But the money given was more in the

form of a reward for flattery than as a recognition for one's talents as a historian. The historians of this period (or those who have come down to us as historians) did not earn their living only by writing. Their writings were usually offshoots of other jobs that they held. What then would be the motivation for someone undertaking to write history? Obviously there were the more mundane reasons such as monetary and other benefits that would accrue from such a venture, especially if the work pleased the authorities. There were also intellectual reasons for writing, as well as personal reasons which we will see in the case of Baranī. History was one way of inspiring loyalty and enthusiasm for Islām. At a time when the world of Islam had received serious blows at the hands of the Mongols, such as the sack of Baghdad, retailing the glories of the religion and the culture of Islam was one way of restoring the social confidence in Islam. Also history was an integral part of the education of a medieval Muslim, and it is not surprising therefore that an educated man should attempt to contribute to it. As Rosenthal puts it:

> Since historical knowledge was the indication of one's education, it must have been a tempting thought for an educated amateur to venture into historical writing. However, in an environment where stylistic requirements in any branch of literature were very high, there cannot have been too many who felt themselves qualified to write on historical subjects. There was no sharp division between historical amateurs and historical scholars. (95)

So we can assume that Minhāj, an educated and well-informed man, would have taken to writing history for reasons material as well as intellectual. What Askari might mean in calling him a professional historian is that he, like the others he names, are known for their books on history while Amīr Khusraw, in connection with whom he makes the statement, was

essentially a poet, history being only incidental to his work.

But can we let the matter rest here? Were Minhāj's non-material motives limited to glorifying Islam per se? Understanding Minhāj's political outlook, or trying to describe its outline from the clues that we can find in his work are the key to understanding the history that he wrote. By tying up the political fortunes of the military commanders who were trying to carve out a territorial base for themselves in India with the glory and the destiny of Islam, he was defining his own political commitments. Minhāj was a careerist par excellence. When he found that it was only beyond the Indus that he could make a safe career, he committed himself to the cause of the state with all his energies, mental and physical. And Minhāj had proved also that he could be a 'holy warrior'.[96] Political authority was the only legitimate cause he knew. It is because of this attitude that he did not have any compunctions against praising Raḍiyyah, ʿAlā' al-Dīn Masʿūd Shāh and Bahrām Shāh all in the course of a few pages. It is also because of this simple, basic and underlying belief, that his history lacks any other obvious forms of political theory. Speaking of kingship, he says only that kings should have virtues/qualities of all kinds.[97] The lessons that he wants to teach through his history are also in keeping with his attitude. For example, "The object in (relating) this incident was this, that it is essential that sovereigns should ever be circumspect and vigilant, and should never leave (their) arms out of their own possession, and should not place confidence in anyone."[98] Or as elsewhere:

> The warning here conveyed is, that it behooveth not a man, in any case, to be passive in the matter of his own safety, particularly when in a place he may be holding parley with a foe, or be in the company of an enemy; and he should see to his own preservation for

some useful purpose, and not be without a weapon.... (99)

We therefore have to read Minhāj's history keeping in mind that his theory of history embraced nothing more than an account of affairs which had direct bearing on the maintenance of power. By including in his history the history of Muslims elsewhere, he was not only following the trend of Islamic historiography of the period towards universal histories but also legitimising the rulers of his own times by including them in a list of great men which also comprehended the Prophet. Keeping his basic presumption in mind, we can make an attempt to define the basic framework of the method that Minhāj used. Because he undertook to write not just the history of contemporary sovereigns, but a universal history, he must have had to depend on sources other than his personal information and knowledge. What were these sources of information and how did he treat them?

We can presume that his scholarship was acknowledged by his contemporaries from the fact that he was associated with all the major madrasahs of the period. In his preface he assures his readers that he has recorded 'what ever was to be found in trustworthy chronicles'.[100] It also seems that he had a large personal library of earlier works. He mentions the kindness of Tāj al-Dīn Sanjar who helped him carry two chests of his books when they had to leave Gwalior.[101] Since he had not been in India for too long at that point in time, he must have travelled to India with them. He mentions quite a few books during the course of his narrative: the Qaṣāṣ-i Thānī of Abul Ḥasan Hayzam al-Nabī,[102] the Ta'rīkh-i Nāsirī of Bayhāqī,[103] the Ta'rīkh-i Majdūl of Abū-l Qāsim 'Imādī,[104] the Ta'rīkh-i Muqaddasī,[105] the Ta'rīkh of Ṭabarī,[106] the

Kitāb-i Tājī of Sābī,[107] and the Book of Genealogies of Fakhr al-Dīn Mubārak Shāh.[108] Though he did seem to trust the written word, his attitude towards written sources is not always uncritical. At one place he expresses dissatisfaction with one of the sources and proceeds to give his own interpretation of the events.[109] Elsewhere he compares information from two sources,[110] and at times he names a number of sources for the same information.[111] Regarding events and matters closer to his own time, he, like Baranī and 'Afīf, as we shall see later, depended on hearsay testimony. He often does not name the sources of this hearsay matter, just referring to his sources as a 'trustworthy person'.[112] At other times he does name his informants.[113] He also mentions having been an eyewitness to a number of events.[114]

The constant use of religious terminology by Minhāj should be expected and is easily explained. The product of an education that was structured almost entirely around religion and other related disciplines, he was equipped with no other terminology but the religious one; further, it was the only one comprehensible to his readers. Every confrontation that he deals with involves an 'army of Islam' against the infidels.[115] His referring to one side as the army or forces of Islam is his simple way of taking sides -- an unsophisticated but honest way of exhibiting his bias. Such a manner of writing was almost a habit with him and had nothing to do with a personal commitment to religion. It did not matter if both sides in a conflict were good Muslims; the distinction between the 'army of Islam' and the infidels is maintained; the confrontation between the royal forces and those of the recalcitrant Qutlugh Khān was one such occasion.[116] When his patron Ulugh Khān was relegated to

an iqṭā' because of the rise of Rayhān at the capital, it was Ulugh Khān's forces and not the royal ones which were the 'armies of Islam',[117] In a similar way he condemned whatever seemed to him to be a defiance of rightful authority.[118] The depiction of Maḥmūd of Ghaznah as a champion of Islam[119] is also not unusual or surprising. It was common to other historians as well.[120]

He draws on other religious themes in addition, but usually for the sake of flattery or because of ignorance. One example is the early history of Ilutumish which is surpising only in its blatant plagiarism of the Qur'anic version of Yūsuf's early life.[121] There is another example. Maḥmūd of Ghaznah is supposed to have carried away the idol of the goddess Manāt from Somnāth.[122] The Hindu pantheon of gods includes no such diety, and again the inspiration comes from Islamic history. One cannot blame him for this mistake because it is unlikely that in his position he would have had any direct contact with the Hindus. It was the same sort of ignorance which led him to identify what might have been Buddhist monks as Brahmans.[123]

Causation in history, according to Minhāj, lay in Divine hands. Muhibbul Hasan feels that such an attitude would be inevitable 'in a society dominated by 'Asharite theology'.[124] There are endless instances of Minhāj attributing causation to the Divine: "As the almighty God had ordained that the whole of the dominions of Iran should fall under the sway of Muḥammad Khwārazm Shāh",[125] or, "Since the Most High and Holy God, from all eternity, had predestined that the states of Hindustan should come under the shadow and guardianship of the great Sultan, the supreme monarch ...."[126]

But the Almighty, according to Minhāj, acted through men. Mukhia feels that for Minhāj causation lay in the volition of humans, or 'the calculated designs of men at the helm of affairs'.[127] This view is implicit in the nature of the history that Minhāj wrote. Such a view would be natural in any political history which is constructed almost entirely around individual rulers as the Tabaqāt-i Nāsirī is. Minhāj is aware of the forces of history even though he is not aware that they lie beyond the actions of the humans to whom he attributes them. Praising Tāj al-Dīn Sanjar, he speaks of his having 'caused' the territories assigned to him to flourish and prosper. And the reasons for this prosperity were 'security, safety and repose of the peasantry'.[128] In spite of his eulogising of Ulugh Khān's personal qualities, he realises that success depended on more than the brilliant qualities of an individual. "May God," he says, "make strong his nobles."[129] God, acting through the right men, who were therefore blessed with strong nobles, made the political system work.

We have to examine Minhāj's attitude towards two important groups in medieval Indian society: the newly emerging group of Indian born Mulsims and the non-Muslims. Minhāj, being very much a part of the ruling élite, should give us some indication of the attitude of the rulers towards these groups. The extreme racialism of the existing group cannot be denied. We have enough indications from other sources to prove the clanishness of the Turkish amīrs, a 'sort of joint family organisation' as Nigam puts it.[130] An illuminating incident is the protestations of the Turkish amīrs over the employment of the future Ulugh Khān in the royal stables, claiming that the task was too menial to be performed

by a Turk.[131] How much of this racialism is evident in Minhāj's work? Or can we document this racialism on the basis of his book? Most of the nobles whom he mentions in connection with Iltutmish's reign are Turks. The case where his racialism is taken to be most evident is that of Minhāj's dealing with ʻImād al-Dīn Rayhān. Talking of the latter's fall from power, Minhāj describes the reason as being:

> that the maliks and servants of the Sultan's court were all Turks of pure lineage and Tājiks of noble birth, and ʻImād al-Dīn Rayhan who was castrated and mutilated, and of the tribes of Hind, was ruling over the Lords of high descent and the whole of them were loathing their state and were unable any longer to suffer that degradation. (132)

Minhāj's statement has been taken at its face value by later historians.[133] But could the matter be as simple as that an Indian born Muslim had overthrown the foreign born nobility at court and begun lording it over them? We can understand Minhāj's attitude towards Rayhān. It was during the period of Rayhān's ascendency that Minhāj was dismissed. Before one can accept Minhāj's version, one has to ask a few questions. If Rayhān's ultimate fall was due to the foreign born nobility resenting him because of his origin, how did Rayhān get into the position where he could displace Ulugh Khān in the first place? What was the basis of Rayhān's support? Was he supported only by Indian born nobles and who were they? We know that one of Rayhān's chief supporters was Qutlugh Khān, Sultān Nāṣir al-Dīn's father-in-law, and it was he who continued the struggle even after Rayhān's eclipse.[134] The struggle obviously involved factions within the nobility, something that was not unusual in the history of the sultanate. But the very fact that Rayhān was involved in a struggle at the level of the royal court indicates that the assimilation of the native elements into the nobility had begun.

Such an outcome was inevitable, and Minhāj only documents it. Minhāj had every reason to dislike Rayhān and therefore chose the easiest label, that of being of the tribes of Hind, to condemn him. As for the case of Qutlugh Khān where Minhāj could not use a racial label, Minhāj simply ignored him, not including him in the list of nobles at the end of his work. Compare this attitude with the treatment of another Indian born noble, Hindū Khān. Minhāj has nothing but praise for him and his 'exemplary conduct'.[135] The crucial factor in the way that Minhāj treats the two men is their conduct. Minhāj approved of Hindū Khān's conduct so his being of the tribes of Hind did not matter.

A similar problem arises if Minhāj is taken too literally in his treatment of the Hindus. By portraying all military campaigns as sacred injunctions against the Hindus enjoined by Islam, he has given a false picture. Accounts such as these taken uncritically have led scholars to talk of the 'unenviable' position of the Hindus[136] and of the 'violence' and 'terrorism' against the helpless Hindus.[137] He talks of 'contumacious infidels in great numbers being sent to hell',[138] of temples being destroyed and mosques being constructed in their place and of the armies of Islam relentlessly engaged in wiping out all traces of <u>kufr</u>. We know of only two major mosques being constructed in this period, and the Muslims continued to be in a minuscule minority. Here we are confronted with an indiscriminate use of religious terminology and a mindless exaggeration of the exploits of his patron and other members of his class to show them in a better light. If the impression given by Minhāj were correct, the sultanate would not have survived. The Muslims in the earlier period were confined to urban centers where they were

superimposed on the already existing administrative and social set up. M. Habib talks of the sultanate of the Slave kings 'beginning at the Ghazni gate and ending at the Badaun gate'.[139] Without the co-operation of Hindu administrative personnel at the village level, no administration could have been possible. Apart from these purely functional arrangements, there would have been little contact between the ordinary Hindu and the conquering Muslim in the early decades of the sultanate. The only time a Hindu chief is mentioned in most of the early Muslim chronicles is at the time of conflict, and obviously in such circumstances he was not going to be portrayed sympathetically. Minhāj does, however, pay compliments to Hindu chiefs at times. He describes Rai Lakhmanniyā as very just because "never did any tyranny proceed from his hand".[140] Another Hindu Rai' is called 'noble and illustrious'.[141] When Hindus are not involved in a political conflict with the Muslims, he treats them at par with the Muslims. Malik Yuz Bak's treachery, he says, was condemned by the 'whole of the people of the Hindustan -- both clergy and laity, Muslims and Hindus'.[142] Iltutmish's greatness lay in the fact that the farmers and traders benefited from his policies .[143] The farmers and traders in Iltutmish's time must have been predominantly Hindus.

Minhāj might be guilty of a more deliberate distortion of history regarding an incident that happened in the reign of Radiyyah. He relates how one Nūr Turk, incited a sect of Ismā'īlīs who had collected in Delhi from Gujarat and Sindh, by attacking the _'ulamā'_. Nūr Turk accused the _'ulamā'_ of being _nāsibī_ and _murji'ī_ and attacked the _'ulamā'_ of both _Shāfi'ī_ and _Hanafī_ madhhabs. A thousand of Nūr Turk's

followers, Minhāj relates, fell upon the Muslim with swords and shields when the Muslims collected for their prayers at the Jāmi' Masjid. The outbreak was quelled, and according to Minhāj, the Malāhidah and 'Qiramitahs' were sent to hell.[144] It is possible that such an uprising may have occured, but Minhāj makes in a point to denigrate Nūr Turk as someone who wanted the Muslims of Delhi attacked and who had collected, in Mujeebs' words, 'loafers and vagabonds around himself'.[145] The Ismā'īlīs had been persecuted from time to time. Maḥmūd of Ghaznah had defeated and dispersed them on 1005 and again in 1009-10. The egalitarian tendencies of the Ismā'īlīs and their attacks on the Sunnī 'ulamā' and their questioning of the legitimcay of the sultanate had caused them to be singled out as targets of attack both by the 'ulamā' and the sultans.[146]

Nizami, on the basis of contemporary ṣūfī sources has cast serious doubt on Minhāj's version. He shows how Raḍiyyah had once sent money to Nūr Turk and that Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn Awliyā' considered him 'purer than water'. Both he and another major ṣūfī saint, Bābā Farīd Ganj-i Shakar, attended his sermons. Nizami also finds honourable mention of Nūr Turk in ṣūfī works such as Akhbār al-Akhyār, Fawā'id al-Fū'ād and the works of 'Abd al-Ḥaqq Dihlawī. This positive mention would have been impossible had Nūr Turk been a heretic (mulhid).[147] Nizami's explanation for Minhāj's calumny is that it was a deliberate distortion of truth. According to Nizami, Nūr Turk openly attacked the ways of the 'ulamā' and he might have singled out Minhāj who was the ṣadr and shaykh al-Islām at that time. This was Minhāj's way of discrediting him for posterity.[148]

For Minhāj, political authority was the final measure. And it is because of this that the most glaring inconsistencies arise in his work. In the tumultuous days of the early sultanate, he praises every sultan. This stand is strange because quite a few of the sultans had come to the throne by violently overthrowing their predecssors. As has been pointed out earlier, his use of terms such as 'armies of Islam' were synonymous with the effort to stay on the right side of authority and to justify it. So firmly was this attitude entrenched in his consciousness that he himself did not see or notice the resultant contradictions within his work. According to him Rukn al-Dīn Fīrūz was 'endowed with gentleness and humanity to perfection , and in bountifulness and liberality he was a second Ḥātim'.[149] But he was replaced because he was wholly inclined towards bufoonery, sensuality and diversion, and 'entirely enslaved by dissipation and debauchery'.[150] Raḍiyyah was endowed with all the admirable qualities necessary for kings .[151] Her being a woman did not bother him at all. But when referring to the wife of a Mongol ruler, her sex was her biggest drawback because "she displayed woman's ways such as proceed from deficiency of intellect and excess of sensuality".[152] He dedicated his work to Sultan Nāṣir al-Dīn and ennumerated his qualities of 'piety, faith, probity, abstinence, compassion, clemency, beneficience, impartiality, dignity, manliness, ardour', etc. and states that such qualities "will not be found united in the person of any of the monarchs among the Sultans of bygone days or of the maliks of the past ages".[153] A few pages earlier he had said something which was a severe indictment of the patron whom he now so praised. Speaking of the objections of the nobles to Iltutmish's

intention of naming his daughter as heir-apparent, he quotes the sultan as saying:

> My sons are engrossed in the pleasures of youth, and none of them possesses the capability of managing the affairs of the country, and by them the government of the kingdom will not be carried out. After my death it will be seen that not one of them will be found to be more worthy of the heir-apparentship than she, my daughter.

And Minhāj adds, "the case turned out as that August monarch had predicted."[154] It must be remembered that Nāṣir al-Dīn was also a son of Iltutmish.

Minhāj was also capable of reversing his position without any apparent discomfiture. He sees the irruption of the Mongols as a sign of the end of the world,[155] and is horrified with the sack of Baghdad at the hands of Halāgū. But in 1260, when the Mongol emmissaries were received at the court of Delhi, Minhāj composed a congratulatory poem for them.[156]

One has to pause and consider the nature of these contradictions. Are they the result of a faulty intellect, feeble memory or sheer indifference towards formulating one's attitude towards things? Or do they represent something deeper? It seems that Minhāj's attitude and ideas were in conformity with the ideology, if it can be called that, of the early sultanate. Minhāj was the product of the situation that he so clearly depicts. His career, activities and ideas must have been typical of others in his situation for him to have succeeded the way he did. In a situation where survival was at stake and no patterns of society or politics had become clear, it was only inevitable that there would be confusion between the profession of ideals and their execution, between the image and the actuality. Minhāj is involved in the power play of

politics at its highest level; that is his only concern, and that is what defines his thinking and what emerges from his work. He, in spite of his involvement with religion, does not get involved with the major religious issues of his time which would distract from the fundamental emphasis on politics. Minhāj had mystic inclinations, was a friend of the ṣūfīs and supporter of the samā'. But he did not want the ṣūfīs to become involved in politics.[157] For them to do so would only add complications to the situation already in existence.

There are other factual inconsistencies in Minhāj's work. He heads the chapter on Ārām Shāh as 'Sultan Ārām Shāh bin Sultan Quṭb al-Dīn Aybak', and he proceeds to say that Quṭb al-Dīn Aybak had only three daughters.[158] Raverty in his commentary on the Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣirī has pointed out a number of such instances.[159] He also omits notable events such as the embassy sent by the 'Abbasid Caliph, al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allah to the court of Iltutmish in 1219-20.[160] He does not include a biographical note on Qutlugh Khān, an important noble, because the latter was an enemy of Balban, even though he is constantly mentioned in the narrative. Minhāj suppresses the fact of Ārām Shāh's murder by Iltutmish.[161] Nigam also points out how he turned the defeat of Malik Nuṣrat al-Dīn Taisī at the hands of Rana Chahar Ajarī into a victory.[162]

In spite of all its shortcomings, we must assign a high place to Minhāj's Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣirī as a source for the early history of the sultanate. It was meant to chronicle the activity of the ruling classes, and that is what it does. He may have made history dull, drab, insipid and soul-less,[163] but we are indebted to him for a great deal of information regarding that period. He obviously took great pains to collect

information, and his sources included many participants in contemporary events. He is responsible for practically all that we know about the period. Because of his close association with the nobles, the information that he gives provide us with details of the functioning of the central administration, service conditions of the nobility, etc. Habibullah accuses him of showing no interest in administrative detail.[164] One may ask if there was any clear emergence of administrative procedure for him to have noticed it. We should not lose sight of the political conditions of the times. The newly established conquerors, faced with conditions far different from the ones to which they were accustomed, left the administrative machinery as they had found it. In essence what had happened was the political replacement of an indigenous ruling class with a foreign one. The new rulers were interested only in collecting the revenue. Habibullah himself admits that "no administrative planning could be undertaken or executed"[165] because "familiarity with the details and problems of day to day administration could not be expected of the newly arrived Turks".[166] How then does he expect Minhāj to be familiar with these details? Why must we judge medieval historians as if they were the writers of modern day history text-books with obligatory chapters on the economy, administration, religion and society?

Another common and similar complaint against Minhāj is that he was so involved with the affairs of the kings and the nobility that he did not pay any attention to the life and conditions of the ordinary people.[167] Surely he was in a good position to give us insights into the life of Indians. As a newly arrived foreigner, travelling in newly conquered territories on his way to Gwalior, Lakhnawtī and Awadh he

must have noticed things which might have struck him as strange and interesting. But these sorts of details do not come within the purview of Minhāj's work. He was writing for an audience and about a milieu that was familiar to him. He was writing about the political activities of the ruling élite and should be judged on that basis. Of course, his history cannot equip us to understand the entire society of that time. And by the same token there are no ideal sources which cover everything that a modern researcher would like to know about the period. One can accept Banerjee's evaluation of Minhāj's work as "a version that is on the whole as satisfactory as the works of a courtier can be".[168] One would have to agree with Habib's answer to Elliot's criticism of the works of medieval Indian historians:

> The political histories of the Middle Ages do not tell us of the institutions and ideas of the people because they are not expected to do so. These subjects came within the purview of quite a different type of literature. (169)

By the other type of literature he means the maktūbāt and malfūzāt genre of ṣūfī literature. These works provide a great deal of insight into the life of the common people because it was the mystic missionary who came into contact with the ordinary people, not the courtier. Both types of literature are valuable, their value being based precisely on their different natures. To deny the Tabāqāt-i Nāṣirī its value because it does not concern itself with day to day like of the people could be extended into denigrating the historical value of the ṣūfī works because they do no deal with the activities of the nobility, or even further, that they do not help us understand how trade and commerce were carried out in the medieval period or how revenue was collected. Histories which concentrate on individuals suffer from an intrinsic weakness.

The role of the individual in history is very minimal. But in a monarchical system, it is necessary to understand how these individuals worked because without understanding that, the understanding of the period would not be complete.

Minhāj's work has to be seen as having been conditioned by his times. An <u>ʿālim</u>, identifying with the political future of the state, and living in politically unsettled and fluid times,[170] he had to come to terms with reality. Religion was to serve the purpose of the state, and that was its prime function as far as the rulers were concerned. No political theory could be expected because the situation was still in flux, and institutions had yet to crystallise. Nearly a century later these institutions not only had crystallised, but tensions had begun to appear in them. Baranī, the historian with whom we deal next, will reflect this change.

NOTES

[1]The Persian text was first edited by W. Nassau Lees, Khadim Hosain and Abdal Hai, Bibliotheca Indica Series (Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1864). This edition excluded all portions not directly related to Indian History. Another text was later edited Abdul Hai Habibi Qandhari (the title page of vol. 2 refers to him as Afghani), vol. 1 (Quetta, 1949), vol. 2 (Lahore: University of Panjab, 1954). It has been translated twice into English: first by H. G. Raverty, 2 vols., Bibliotheca Indica Series (Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1881, reprint ed. New Delhi: Oriental Books Reprint Corporation, 1970), and then by Henry M. Elliot and John Dowson, The History of India as Told by its Own Historians, vol. 2 (London: Trübner & Co., 1869), pp. 359-83. Saiyid Athar Abbas Rizvi has translated a part of it in A Source of Book of Medieval Indian History in Hindi, vol 2: Ādī Turk Kālīn Bhārat (Aligarh: Department of History, Aligarh Muslim University, 1956), pp. 6-99. I have relied almost entirely on Raverty's translation (hereafter, Raverty). This translation has generally been accepted as "extremely faithful, erring, if anything, on the side of literalness," John Andrew Boyle, "The Mongol Commanders in Afghanistan and India according to the Tabaqāt-i Nāsirī of Jūzjānī," Islamic Studies, 2 (1963): 236. V. V. Barthold is very critical of Raverty, but his criticism only concerns Raverty's commentary and not the translation, Turkestan Down to the Mongol Invasions, trans. and revised from Russian by the author with assistance from H. A. R. Gibb (London: Luzac & Co., 1928), pp. 60-61. References unless otherwise stated, are from Raverty but they have also been cross checked with the Persian texts.

[2]He refers to himself as Abū ʻUmar ʻUthmān bin Muḥammad al-Minhāj Sirāj al-Jūzjānī, Habibi, vol. 1, p. 7. Raverty in his translation omits Sirāj, Raverty, p. xxxiii. The Bibliotheca Indica text does not include the preface, but on the title page he is referred to as Abū ʻUmar Minhāj al-Dīn ʻUthmān bin Sirāj al-Dīn al-Jūzjānī. C. P. Storey refers to him as Minhāj al-Dīn ʻUmar ʻUthmān b. Sirāj al-Dīn Muḥammad Jūzjānī, Persian Literature: A Bio-Bibliographical Survey, vol. 1 (London: The Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, 1970), p. 68. According to A. A. Bazmee Ansari, it is ʻAmr, not ʻUmar, "al-Djūzdjānī," EI[2] , p. 609. Raverty insists that his nisbah is Jūrjānī but every other authority, as also the two Persian texts, refer to him as Jūzjānī. Here he is referred to as Minhāj-i Sirāj Jūzjānī as he referes to himself in the opening of quite a few chapters of the Tabaqāt-i Nāsirī.

[3]Baranī explicitly states that he will start where Minhāj stopped even though he begins his history six years later, Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī, ed., Saiyid Ahmad Khan, Bibliotheca Indica Series (Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1862), p. 21.

[4]ʻAfīf claimed to have completed Baranī's unfinished history, Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī, ed Maulvi Vilayat Husain, Bibliotheca Indica Series (Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1891), p. 30.

[5]For the biography of the other two historians, see the respective chapters below.

[6]Raverty, p. xxxiii.

[7]The Bibliotheca Indica edition of the text omits chapters 1-10 and 12-16 but Habibi's edition includes the entire work. Raverty in his translation has summarised the first six tabaqahs.

[8]Franz Rosenthal, A History of Muslim Historiography (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968), p. 71.

[9]Raverty, pp. 389-91.

[10]Ibid., pp. 624-27.

[11]Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, Salāṭīn-i Dihlī ke Madhhabī Rujhānāt (Delhi: Nadwat al-Muṣṣannafīn, 1958), p. 22.

[12]Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, Some Aspects of Religion and Politics in in India during the Thirteenth Century, 2d ed. (Delhi: Idarah-i Adabiyat-Delli, 1974), p. 152.

[13]Baranī, Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī, pp. 154-55.

[14]Ibid., p. 111.

[15]Ibid., p. 21.

[16]See Mohammad Habib and Afsar Umar Salim Khan, Political Theory of the Delhi Sultanate (Allahabad: Kitab Mahal, n.d.), p. 136.

[17]Nizami, Madhhabī, p. 15.

[18]Raverty, p. 384.

[19]R. P. Tripathi, Some Aspects of Muslim Administration (Allahabad: Central Book Depot, 1959), p. 2.

[20]Agha Mahdi Ḥusain, The Tughlaq Dynasty, enl. and rev. ed. of of Rise and Fall of Muhammad bin Tughlaq (Calcutta: Thacker, Spink & Co. Pvt. Ltd., 1963), p. 531. He also telss us that the government was 'anti-democratic with little consideration for socialism.'

[21]S. D. Goitien, "The Muslim Government as seen by its Non-Muslim Subjects," Journal of the Pakistan Historical Society, 12 (1964): 2.

[22]S. Nurul Hasan, "Sahifa-i Na't-i Muhammadi of Zia-ud-Din Barani," Medieval India Quarterly, 1, iii&iv (1950): 102, 104-105.

[23]Mohammad Habib, "An Introduction to the Study of Medieval India," Politics and Society in Early Medieval Period, ed. Khaliq Ahmad Nizami (Delhi: Peoples Publishing House, 1974), pp. 16-18.

[24]Nizami, Some Aspects, p. 316.

[25]H. Nelson Wright, Coinage and Meteorology of the Sultans of Delhi (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936), p. 14.

[26]Nizami, Madhhabī, pp. 94-96.

[27]Ibid., pp. 112-13.

[28]Raverty., p. 599.

[29]Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, "Iltutmish the Mystic," Islamic Culture, 20 (1946): 165-80, and "The Religious Leanings of Iltutmish," Studies in Medieval Indian History and Culture (Allahabad: Kitab Mahal, 1966), pp. 13-41.

[30]Raverty, p. 619.

[31]One of Quṭb al-Dīn Aybak's first acts was the pulling down of a number of Hindu temples to construct a mosque, the Quwwat al-Islām mosque at Mehrauli. Before the improvements and modifications which were made later, the original structure was of no architectural value. The only significance of building the mosque must have been a symbolic one; i.e, that the Turks intended to stay. See Percy Brown, Indian Architecture: Islamic Period, 2d ed., rev. and enl. (Bombay: D. B. Taraporevala Sons & Co. Ltd., n.d.), pp. 9-15.

[32]Iltutmish, however, had no compunctions about attacking another ruler, Ghiyāth al-Dīn 'Iwāz Khaljī of Bengal who also had received a similar recognition from the same caliph, Asit Kumar Sen, People and Politics in Early Medieval India (Calcutta: Indian Book Distribution Company, 1963), p. 2.

[33]Nizami, Madhhabī, p. 55.

[34]Aziz Ahmad, An Intellectual History of Islam in India, Islamic Surveys, 7 (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1969), p. 3.

[35]Nizami, Some Aspects, pp. 158-71. See also Aziz Ahmad, "The Role of Ulema in Indo-Muslim History," Studia Islamica, 31 (1970): 2.

[36]Mu'īn al-Dīn Chistī, one of the leading ṣūfīs of the period was also a disciple of 'Uthmān Hārūnī. See Aziz Ahmad, "The Sufi and Sultan in Pre-Mughal India," Der Islam, 38 (1962): 142.

[37]Raverty, p. 541.

[38]Ibid., p. 644.

[39]Ibid., p. 646.

[40]U. N. Day, The Government of the Sultanate (New Delhi: Kumar Brothers, 1972), pp. 184-85.

[41]Nizami, Madhhabī, p. 53.

[42]Ishtiaq Husain Qureshi, Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi, 5th ed., rev. (Delhi: Oriental Books Reprint Corporation, 1971) p. 176.

[43]Tripathi, Some Aspects, p. 17.

[44]Peter Hardy, "Islam in Medieval India," Sources of Indian Tradition, ed. Wm. Theodore de Bary (New York: Columbia University Press, 1960), p. 383.

[45]Raverty, p. 619.

[46]Ibid., p. 656.

[47]Ibid., p. 659.

[48]S. B. P. Nigam, Nobility under the Sultans of Delhi (Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1968), p. 121.

[49]Qādīs were assigned iqtā's; see A. B. M. Habibullah, "Provincial Government under the Mameluke Sultans of Delhi," Indian Historical Quarterly, 19 (1943): 259.

[50]Nizami, Some Aspects, p. 172.

[51]Raverty, p. 713.

[52]Baranī, Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī, p. 351.

[53]Banarsi Prasad Saksena, "Firuz Shah Tughlaq," Comprehensive History of India, vol. 5, eds. Mohammad Habib and Khaliq Ahmad Nizami (New Delhi: People Publishing House, 1970), p. 582.

[54]He says he was in his eighteenth year in 1211; see Raverty, p. 396.

[55]Ibid., p. 104.

[56]Ibid., p. 301.

[57]Ibid., p. 195.

[58]Ibid. p. 1007.

[59]Ibid., p. 1197.

[60]Ibid., pp. 1203-4.

[61]Ibid., p. 541.

[62]Ibid., pp. 541-42.

[63]Ibid., p. 722-23.

[64]Ibid., p. 615.

[65]Minhāj calls him Mangal Dev, but he was most probably Malayavarmadeva; see A.B.M. Habibullah, The Foundation of Muslim Rule in India, 2d. ed., rev. (Allahabad: Central Book Depot, 1961), p. 102.

[66]Minhāj gives a different account later, Raverty, p. 745.

[67]Ibid., p. 620.

[68]Raverty, pp. 643-44. Rizvi, accepting Minhāj's statement says

he must have fulfilled his duties as the qādī of Gwalior through deputies, see Ādī Turk Kalīn Bharat, p. 2. This seems very unlikely because Gwalior had been abandoned by Radiyyah to Chahar Deva, the founder of the Jajapella dynasty (hence the evacuation of the administrative personnel including Minhāj), see Habibullah, Foundation, pp. 150-51.

[69]Raverty, p. 649.

[70]Ibid., p. 656.

[71]Ibid., p. 658.

[72]Ibid., pp. 658-60.

[73]Ibid., pp. 665-67. Here again the last appointment seems unlikely unless it was purely honorific. We hear of Ulugh Khān leading an expedition against Gwalior in 1251. See Habibullah, Foundation, p. 157.

[74]Raverty, p. 690.

[75]Ibid., p. 694.

[76]Ibid., p. 698.

[77]Ibid., p. 701.

[78]Habibullah, Foundation, p. 161. Earlier, Habibullah asserts that Minhāj had lived till the accession of Balban, p. 11. How one reconciles this, Habibullah does not say.

[79]Baranī, Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī, p. 111.

[80]Raverty, p. 716, n. 5.

[81]Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, "Balban the Regicide," Studies in Medieval Indian History and Culture, pp. 41-53.

[82]Habibullah, Foundation, p. 161. See also Hardy, Historians, p. 123.

[83]Raverty, p. 716, n. 5.

[84]Ibid., p. 858.

[85] Ibid., p. xxxiv.

[86] This royal grace came in the form of 10,000 jitals, and a grant of revenue from the Sultan, and 20,000 jitals from Ulugh Khan. Ibid., pp. 1294-95.

[87] Quoted in Nizami, Some Aspects, p. 166.

[88] Mumtaz Moin, "Qādī Minhāj al-Dīn Sirāj al-Jūzjānī, Journal of the Pakistan Historical Society, 15 (1967): 170.

[89] Elliot and Dowson, History of India, vol. 2, p. 262.

[90] Raverty, p. 1296.

[91] Ibid., p. 715.

[92] Ibid., p. 865.

[93] Ibid., p. 794, 864.

[94] Syed Hasan Askari, "Amir Khusrau as a Historian," Historians of Medieval India, ed. Mohibbul Hasan, with a Foreward by Muhammad Mujeeb (Meerut: Meenakshi Prakashan, 1968), p. 22.

[95] Rosenthal, Historiography, p. 55.

[96] Raverty, p. 1007.

[97] Minhāj, Tabaqāt-i Nāsirī, Bibliotheca Indica text, pp. 184-85. Raverty, p. 637, translates it as "that sovereigns should have justice".

[98] Raverty, p. 1214.

[99] Ibid., p. 1067.

[100] Ibid., p. xxxiv.

[101] Ibid., p. 755.

[102] Ibid., p. 11.

[103] Ibid., pp. 67-68.

104 Ibid., p. 69.

105 Ibid., pp. 6, 305.

106 Ibid., p. 6.

107 Ibid., p. 60.

108 Ibid., pp. 300, 301, 302. Wajahat Mirza has pointed out that Minhāj had seen the work at Fīrūz Kūh in 602 H. when he was only a boy of thirteen and had made no attempt to see the introduction which was added later and dealt with Quṭb al-Dīn Aybak, The Muslim Historians of India from 602/1205 to 658/1259, Ph.D. dissertation, University of London, 1934.

109 Raverty, p. 56.

110 Ibid., pp. 67-70, 307-11.

111 Ibid., pp. 303-4.

112 Ibid., pp. 465, 497, 893-94.

113 Ibid., p. 963.

114 Ibid., pp. 864, 893, 1197.

115 Ibid., pp. 451, 457, 460, 464, 465, 468, 474, 475, 477.

116 Ibid., pp. 705-6.

117 Ibid., p. 828.

118 Ibid., p. 764.

119 Ibid., pp. 82-87.

120 See C. E. Bosworth, "Maḥmūd of Ghazna in Contemporary Eyes and in later Persian Literature," Iran, 4 (1966): 85-92; and Peter Hardy, "Maḥmūd of Ghazna and the Historians," Journal of the Punjab University History Society, 14 (1962): 1-36.

121 Raverty, pp. 599-600.

[122] Ibid., p. 82.

[123] Ibid., pp. 552, 570, n. 9.

[124] Mohibbul Hasan, ed. , Historians of Medieval India, p. xii.

[125] Raverty, p. 382.

[126] Ibid., p. 597.

[127] Harbans Mukhia, Historians and Historiography During the Reign of Akbar (New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., 1976), p. 17.

[128] Raverty, p. 724.

[129] Ibid., p. 721.

[130] Nigam, Nobility, p. 106.

[131] Nizami, "Balban the Regicide," p. 46.

[132] Raverty, p. 829.

[133] The best example is Paramatma Saran, "Politics and Personalities in the Reign of Nasiruddin Mahmud, the Slave," Studies in Medieval Indian History (Hyderabad, Deccan: Apex, 1964), pp. 223-48.

[134] See Nigam, Nobility, pp. 39-41.

[135] Raverty, pp. 744-46.

[136] R. C. Majumdar, gen. ed., The History and Culture of the Indian People, vol. 5: The Struggle for Empire (Bombay: Bhartiya Vidya Bhavan, 1956), p. 499.

[137] Ibid., p. 500.

[138] Raverty, pp. 678-79.

[139] M. Habib, "An Introduction to the Study of Medieval India," p. 22.

[140] Raverty, p. 555.

[141]One can argue that he compliments these rulers only to add to the glory of Ulugh Khān's victory over them. Ibid., p. 828.

[142]Ibid., p. 764.

[143]Ibid., p. 598.

[144]Ibid., pp. 646-47.

[145]Muhammad Mujeeb, Indian Muslims (Montréal: McGill University Press, 1976), p. 99, n. 1.

[146]Peter Hardy, "Islam in Medieval India," p. 383.

[147]Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, The Life and Times of Shaikh Farid-u'd-Din Ganj-i- Shakar (Aligarh: Department of History, Aligarh Muslim University, 1955), p. 31, n. 6.

[148]Nizami, Madhhabī, pp. 137-38.

[149]Raverty, p. 630.

[150]Ibid., p. 636.

[151]Ibid., p. 637.

[152]Ibid., p. 1144.

[153]Ibid., p. 674.

[154]Ibid., p. 639.

[155]Tabaqāt-i Nāsirī, Bibliotheca Indica Text, pp. 325-26. Raverty does not translate this.

[156]Ibid., pp. 319-20. Raverty does not translate the poem, see pp. 856-58.

[157]Saiyid Athar Abbas Rizvi, History of Sufism, vol. 1 (New Delhi: Vikas Publising House Pvt. Ltd., 1976), p. 17.

[158]Raverty, pp. 528-30.

[159]Ibid., pp. 534, n. 1, 604, n. 1.

[160]Bazmee Ansari, "al-Djūzdjānī," p. 609.

[161]Nigam, Nobility, p. 25, n. 9.

[162]Ibid., p. 3.

[163]Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, "Ziya-ud-Din Barani," Historians of Medieval India, ed. Mohibbul Hasan, pp. 45-46.

[164]Habibullah, Foundation, p. 12.

[165]Ibid., p. 232.

[166]Ibid., p. 249.

[167]Muhibbul Hasan, ed., Historians, p. xii.

[168]A. C. Banerjee, "Kingship and Nobility in the Thirteenth Century," Indian Historical Quarterly, 11 (1935): 235.

[169]M. Habib, Politics and Society, p. 7.

[170]Minhāj is aware of this fluidity and insecurity when he deals with the four rival centers of Muslim power in India: Delhi, Lakhnawtī, Uchch and Lahore. Though he had clearly thrown in his lot with the powers in Delhi, he had acknowledged that Delhi still was only one of the rival centers. By the time of Baranī the preponderance of Delhi had been established so he did not feel the need to deal with other Muslim powers even though the Muslim power in the south was beginning to defy the sultans of Delhi.

CHAPTER II

DIYĀ' AL-DĪN BARANĪ[1]

Diyā' al-Dīn Baranī takes up the historical narrative of the sultanate of Delhi from the reign of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Balban (1266-86)[2] bringing it down to the reign of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq (1351-88). He is our main source for the crucial period of the history of northern India under Balban, the Khaljīs, and the Tughlaqs and is the authority from whom later historians such as Farishtah, ʻAfīf, Sirhindī, ʻAbd al-Ḥaqq Dihlawī, Badā'ūnī and Niẓām al-Dīn Aḥmad[3] very often draw their information regarding this period.

If he is the main source of our information, his Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī,[4] along with his other major work, the Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī,[5] are also the cause of a great number of the controversies that plague modern historiography of the period. These controversies arise, not only because of the facts that he provides, but also because of the socio-political attitudes that underlie the entire work, and hence define the selection and presentation of these facts. It is therefore necessary to re-evaluate Baranī and his work so as to place him in a clearer perspective. To do this one must keep his personal history in mind, consider the motives which have prompted him to spend his last years writing one book after another, analyse his prejudices and biases and indicate the fundamentals of his thought. It is also necessary to outline the contradictions that appear in his work and to evaluate his contribution as a historian and the merit of his work.

Study the historian before you study his history suggests Carr.[6] In no case would this advice be more fruitful than in the case of Baranī. Not only were his attitudes towards society reflective of his social origin and his background, but his personal frustrations also deeply coloured his narrative. His training as an 'ālim defined his religo-political outlook, and this outlook can be taken as indicative of the attitudes of a section of the 'ulamā' who were alarmed at the institutionalisation of the initial compromises that the Muslim governing class had had to make in order to survive in India.

It is generally agreed that Baranī was born in 1284/85.[7] This date is based on Baranī's own statement in the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī that he was seventy-four years of age[8] (according to the lunar calendar) when he was writing his history and that he completed the work in 758/1357-58.[9] Elsewhere he says that at the time of writing, Balban had been dead for seventy years.[10] This would again put the date of its composition around the year 756/1355-56. There are, however, other indications which confuse the issue. He mentions that he was writing ninety-five years after Minhāj had written.[11] Minhāj, as we have seen in the last chapter, had finished his Tabaqāt-i Nāṣirī about 658/1259-60. This would place the date of the composition of the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shahī in the year 753/1352-53.[12] This confusion is typical of Baranī's attitude towards chronological accuracy. In spite of indications to the contrary, we can safely assume that he completed his work around 1357-58 because he describes the events of the first six years of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq's reign and because it is more probable that he remembered his own age more accurately than the number of years since Minhāj had written.

Baranī is extremely proud of his heredity. On his mother's side he came from a family of sayyids. His maternal grandfather, Sipahsālār Ḥusām al-Dīn was the wakīl-i dar of Malik Ikhtiyār al-Dīn Sulṭān Bārbak.[13] Scholars like A. S. Khan, Rizvi, Nizami and S. H. Barani, in order to strengthen Baranī's credentials as an 'insider', say that Ḥusām al-Dīn was the wakīl-i dar and bārbak of Balban.[14] This is obviously based on presuming a wa instead of an iḍāfah in Baranī's statement: "az sipasālār Ḥusām al-Dīn jadd-i mādarī-i khwud ki wakīl-i dar-i Bārbak Sulṭān Balban būd."[15] They have obviously mistaken Malik Ikhtiyār al-Dīn Bektars Sulṭān Bārbak,[16] a noble of Balban's time, for the office of Bārbak. Ḥusām al-Dīn was later appointed to the Shahnagī of Lakhnawtī by Balban and entrusted with the responsibility of keeping the royal forces which were pursuing the rebel Tughril, informed of news from the capital.[17] Ḥusām al-Dīn's appointment as administrator of Lakhnawtī makes sense when we remember that Balban had sent of Malik Bārbak, who had been in charge of Lakhnawtī, at the head of a scouting party to locate Tughril.[18] That Ḥusām al-Dīn was in the employment of one of Balban's nobles rather than Balban himself is confirmed by the fact that Baranī does not mention him in the list of nobles of Balban's reign. Nevertheless, knowing Balban's fetish for correct lineage, we can safely assume, as does Habib, that Ḥusām al-Dīn was an emigré of pure Turkish lineage.[19]

On his father's side too, he was well connected. His grandmother was the daughter of a venerated sayyid family of Kaithal.[20] We get no indication of what his grandfather did. Haq, Rizvi and S. H. Barani hold that he was important enough to have been either a wazīr or holder

of some other high office.[21] This is based on the alleged statement of 'Alā' al-Dīn Khaljī quoted by Baranī where 'Alā' al-Dīn addresses the author's uncle as wazīr zādah.[22] Apart from the problem of accepting the dialogues that Baranī puts into the mouths of various people, Baranī himself contradicts this description when he again quotes 'Alā' al-Dīn, when the king rejects Baranī's uncle 'Alā' al-Mulk's advice as to how to deal with the Mongol threat, saying that he is a nawīsandah and a nawīsandah zādah[23] (scribe, clerk or accountant and son of the same). Surely if Baranī's grandfather had been important enough to have been a wazīr, Baranī would have mentioned this fact, in view of his pride in his own lineage. He does not even mention his grandfather's name nor does he quote him as a source as he does with his other ancestors.

It is more likely that Baranī's paternal grandfather was a minor provincial officer whose family, fleeing the depradations of the Mongols, had settled in Baran (modern day Buland Shahr). Baran had been a Rajput stronghold which had been reduced by Aybak.[24] Iltutmish, before he became sultan was the ʿāmil of Baran, and had apparently attracted a number of shuyūkh and 'ulamā' who had settled there.[25] His father, Mū'id al-Mulk, was the nā'ib of Arkalī Khān,[26] the second son of Jalāl al-Dīn Khaljī and was given the niyābat and khwājgī of Baran.[27] It was his father's brother 'Alā' al-Mulk who did well in the royal service and who must have been the real reason for getting Baranī closer to the royal circles. Close to 'Alā' al-Dīn from the time that 'Alā' al-Dīn was in charge of Kara, and implicated with him in the murder of Jalāl al-Dīn Khaljī,[28] 'Alā' al-Mulk was entrusted with Kara and Awadh right in the beginning of 'Alā' al-Dīn's reign.[29] He was later left in charge of the capital,

along with the treasury and the royal haram, as its kotwāl, when 'Alā' al-Dīn went out to deal with the Mongols.[30] 'Alā' al-Mulk also seems to have played the role of a royal counsellor, for Baranī credits him with having advised 'Alā' al-Dīn on how to deal with the Mongol threat,[31] to stop drinking and pay more attention to matters of state.[32] Baranī also gives him the credit of talking 'Alā' al-Dīn out of his crazy ideas of founding a new religion and emulating Alexander the Great. If we are to believe Baranī, it was his uncle who gave 'Alā' al-Dīn the idea of conquering Ranathambor, Chanderī, Chittor, Malwa and Ujjain.[33] Baranī also tells us that his uncle could not rise above being kotwāl because he was over-weight.[34]

Baranī moved to the environs of the royal capital when his father bought a house in Kīlokharī,[35] a place earlier chosen by Kayqubād for the royal residence.[36] Baranī must therefore have been brought up in an urban setting, typical of the nobility which, though deriving its income from rural areas, spent it at leisure in the cities. He finished the Qur'ān and learnt to write before he reached puberty.[37] There are many indications of his intellectual and religious pursuits, typical of someone who did not have to earn a living. He mentions forty-six great religious scholars of the reign of 'Alā' al-Dīn Khaljī and says that he had either studied under them or had heard their discourses.[38] He was introduced into Chistī mystic circles under the influence of his father and claims that he was inseparable from Amīr Khusraw and Amīr Ḥasan Sanjarī.[39] But this flirtation with sufism did not make an ascetic of him. Hob-nobbing with ṣūfīs was fashionable with the Muslim élite, and Baranī continued living a life of a young man of leisure. He

often describes attendance at mahfils where he was entertained by beautiful sāqīs, pretty boys and ghazal singers. He even compiled a collection of his ghazals, Qubbat al-Ta'rīkh, in praise of these beauties.[40] He was a known raconteur[41] and an interesting story-teller with a large repertoire,[42] qualities which must have stood him in good stead when he gained employment at the court of Muhammad ibn Tughlaq. Neither Baranī himself or Kirmānī, who is the only contemporary to have given any biographical details about Baranī, mentions any other job that he held. Habibullah surmises, on the basis of what he takes as Baranī's exceptional familiarity with matters agrarian that he might have been a revenue official.[43] In the absence of any corroborative information, this is at best only a conjecture. Even if Baranī had had a job, it was too minor or unimportant for Baranī himself even to have mentioned it.

The only important position that Baranī held was in Muhammad ibn Tughlaq's court. He nowhere mentions what his appointment was, but on the basis of the information in the Siyar al-Awliyā' it is possible that he was a nadīm of Muhammad ibn Tughlaq.[44] The nadīm usually had no official position and could speak to the sultan only when spoken to, and his prime function was to entertain the sultan.[45] Baranī seems to have had the necessary talents "to be able to converse about any conceivable historical subject".[46] Baranī must also have been equipped with the other requirements demanded of a nadīm. In the words of Ashraf, a nadīm:

> combined in himself a variety of talents: he knew the niceties of sartorial equipment and personal decoration until it almost became a fine art; his conversation was in the choicest language; his intellectual culture covered a variety of knowledge, namely, the study of chronicles, the Qur'ān, poetry, folklore,

> together with some acquaintance with metaphysics and the occult and some mystic elements of Islam. Finally he was an accomplished player of chess and draughts and a fairly good player of some musical instruments. But above all these attainments, his great art consisted in putting the Sultān into good humour, by a careful study of his oddities and idiosyncracies. (47)

The Siyar al-Awliyā' attests to these talents of Baranī, not only as a master story-teller, but also as an efficient flatterer.[48]

Baranī acted as courtier to Muḥammad ibn Tughlaq for a period of seventeen years and three months,[49] finally having got an entrée into royal circles when he was in his fifties. Muḥammad ibn Tughlaq was very kind to him, and Baranī acknowledges that all that he had achieved was due to the kindness of the monarch and that he had acquired wealth and status to an extent that he had never thought possible.[50] Baranī records a few conversations with the king who once queried Baranī about the causes of the rebellions that plagued his rule[51] and called upon Baranī's historical knowledge to find out how previous kings had dealt with such rebellions.[52] Baranī, most probably afraid of antagonising the king, admits to having kept quiet.[53] He also admits how, for fear of losing his wealth and position, he never complained to Muḥammad ibn Tughlaq about his cruelty and non-shar'ī punishments.[54]

Baranī was close to other nobles as well. He mentions how he acted as the envoy of Qutlugh Khān to Muḥammad ibn Tughlaq to discourage the king from personally going to quell a rebellion.[55] He also carried the congratulations from Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq, Malik Kabīr and Aḥmad Ayāz when Muḥammad ibn Tughlaq was victorious at Dewgīr.[56]

His decline, in spite of his earlier cordial relations with Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq, coincided with the enthronement of Muḥammad

ibn Tughlaq's successor. What the precise reasons for this were we will never know because Baranī is very guarded about the circumstances, talking in generalities rather than in specifics. Siyar al-Awliyā' implies that when he reached the age of seventy, he sought voluntary retirement from the court and spent the rest of his life in piety.[57] All that Baranī says about the subject is:

> After the death of the late Sultan, I Zia-i Barani, author of Tarikh-i Firuz Shahi fell into a variety of mortal dangers. Ill wishers against my life and powerful and strong enemies and rivals strove for my death. I was, so to say, driven to madness by the polo-sticks of their hatred. They attributed to me a thousand kinds of poisonous words before his majesty. (58)

In the preface of Sahīfah-i Na't-i Muhammadī Baranī mentions that he was imprisoned for five months. Nurul Hasan has read this place as Pahtez,[59] a place not easily identifiable. Mahdi Husain reads it as Bhatnīr.[60] It is very likely that the place was Bhatnīr, and the reading of it as Pahtez could be the result of a copyist's error. Baranī himself casually mentions, in the course of the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī that he had been in the fortress of Bhatnīr.[61] We can only speculate about the reasons for this imprisonment and Baranī's subsequent misery.

Obviously his disgrace was connected in some way to the events following Muhammad ibn Tughlaq's death. Mahdi Husain feels that Baranī was made a scapegoat for the "crimes of the deceased emperor".[62] This does not seem very likely because Baranī was not that important in Muhammad ibn Tughlaq's reign to have been picked on to bear the responsibility of the Sultan's policies. Nizami and Day[63] are categorical in their conviction that he had sided with Khwājah-i Jahān who had placed

a supposed son of the late Sultan on the throne. It could have been so. Baranī, anxious to maintain his privileged position, would have sided with Khwājah-i Jahān who had been put in charge of the capital by Muḥammad ibn Tughlaq. Politically naive, he may not have realised that Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq would be more astute in realising his ambitions to the throne.[64] Baranī must have realised his mistake because he tries very hard to make amends, saying that those who had sided with Khwājah-i Jahān had done so only because they had been bribed by him and actually had hoped that Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq would appear and take Delhi.[65] He was most probably only a sympathiser and not a conspirator because the main participants were executed.[66] His later vehemence against Khwājah-i Jahān and his questioning of the legitimacy of the child[67] who had been placed on the throne were his ways of atoning for his earlier indiscretion. He also might have been a victim of court intrigue. Enemies whom he might have made as a courtier at Muḥammad ibn Tughlaq's court or those who might have wanted to replace him as royal courtiers could have used his role in the Khwājah-i Jahān conspiracy to have him banished from the court. Hence Baranī's constant condemnation of those who had carried tales against him. Habib suggests that his fall could have come about because of Khān-i Jahān, the <u>wazīr</u> of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq, who being a convert from Hinduism, could have hated Baranī for his views on Hindus.[68] This seems very unlikely. Having converted and then agreed to serve under Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq, a Sultan not known for his liberalism towards any religious group except <u>Sunnī</u> Muslims,[69] Khān-i Jahān could hardly have taken offence at Baranī's anti-Hinduism.

Whatever the causes, Baranī seems to have suffered in the last

years of his life. Old and toothless,[70] he was miserably poor.[71] He ended up as a social outcaste because he mentions how no one would give him refuge or credit to alleviate his poverty.[72] His property and all his wealth must have been confiscated.[73]

It was during this enforced exile that Baranī occupied himself with writing books. The Siyar al-Awliyā' mentions six books: Thanā'-i Na'ṭ-i Muḥammadī (which might have been the same as Ṣaḥīfah-ī Na'ṭ-i Muḥammadī), Ṣalāt-i Kabīr, 'Ināyat Nāmah-i Ilāhī, Ma'āthir-i Sadāt, Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī and Ḥasrat Nāmah.[74] He also translated the Ta'rīkh-i Barmakiyān from Arabic into Persian and wrote the Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī. One of the reasons for this intense literary activity was the desire to ingratiate himself with Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq. Not only did he dedicate his major history to Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq but also dedicated the Ta'rīkh-i Barmakiyān to him.[75]

Baranī's efforts did not get him very far because Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq did not see his Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī during Baranī's lifetime. But Baranī did return to Delhi and did get some sort of minor pension as the Siyar al-Awliyā' indicates.[76] This was most probably at the intervention of Malik Shikār Bak Wamlān Sulṭānī, whom Baranī praises for his kindness.[77] But this pension definitely did not amount to patronage by Fīrūz Shāh as Majumdar suggests.[78] He died in great poverty[79] and was buried in the same cemetery as Niẓām al-Dīn Awliyā' at Ghiyāthpur.[80] Fīrūz Shāh did get to read Baranī's Ta'rikh-i Fīrūz Shāhī after Baranī's death and was flattered enough to ask Shams-i Sirāj 'Afīf to continue it.[81]

Before we move on to discussing Baranī's Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz

Shāhī and Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī, his two major works which bear directly on the history of the sultanate of Delhi and which concern us in this chapter, we should try to understand the underlying motives which prompted Baranī's literary activity. Was it as simple as Mahdi Husain suggests when he says that in the end Baranī chose the writing of history as the best calling?[82] Hardy, even though he admits that Baranī expected a reward from Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq, lays a great deal of emphasis on the larger, more universal aims of Baranī:

> ....he believed that he was offering to God something which would open the eyes of mankind to God and, to the Sultan something which would benefit him in this world and the next .... For Ta'rīkh to Barani is true religion and morality teaching by examples, an indispensable study for the good life. It warns readers to avoid the base and contemptible. It is knowledge of the annals and traditions of prophets, caliphs, sultans, and other great men of both religion and government. (83)

Baranī, according to Hardy, is trying to teach men the 'lessons of history' in order to save their souls[84] and to teach the sultans of Delhi their duty towards Islām.[85]

True, Baranī thought that his efforts would help others. He also treats his work as an atonement for his sins in not criticising Muhammad ibn Tughlaq for his cruelty and his irreligiosity.[86] His Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī is a pious deed, for he ends his efforts with a sūrah saying that good deeds are not wasted.[87] He also has a high regard for the discipline of history and its historical and religious functions and advantages. He ennumerates the following benefits that accrue from the study of history:

1. It familiarises men with the Word of God, the deeds of the Prophets, and the actions of rulers and their misdeeds. In short it acts as a

warning to people.

2. *Hadīth* which is so important for Muslims is a twin of history, and *hadīth* cannot be understood without history.

3. History helps in increasing the intellect and also in making the right judgements.

4. It helps the sultans, *maliks* and *wazīrs* in remaining calm in moments of crisis and in taking the right decisions based on the experiences of those gone before.

5. History teaches fortitude to Muslims by showing the vicissitudes that prophets went through so that the people do not despair.

6. History, by showing the evil effects of bad deeds and the good results of virtuous actions, helps the rulers to be righteous.

7. Since history is inseparable from the truth, it helps people distinguish good from evil.[88]

So, having discovered the benefits of history, Baranī says, he decided to write one.[89] But it would be naive to take Baranī's claim at its face value. Considerations more mundane went along with these lofty ideals, not the least of which were pecuniary. He bemoans that apart from not achieving any religious merit (which the writing about the life and deeds of the Prophet was to remedy), he also had not been able to savour the worldly pleasures which should have been his birthright as a person of 'graceful nature and delicate temperament'.[90] Simple, worldly comforts must have been foremost in his mind because he gives us a grim picture of his poverty and the misery of his last days, of how his eyes bled while he wrote.[91] He prays aloud that Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq should see his book so that his efforts would not go wasted,[92]

and he later repeats the plea for someone to whom he may present his history and who might appreciate it enough to reward him.[93]

Nizami asserts that Baranī did not write to ingratiate himself with Fīrūz Shāh. This opinion he bases on the premise that Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq had too high a regard for Muḥammad ibn Tughlaq, and Baranī's criticism would not have pleased him.[94] This view is not borne out by the facts. Baranī more than once says that his sufferings would end if only the king could see his work.[95] And then, Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq did see the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī, and was pleased enough with it to desire its continuation.

Having spelt out the advantages of history, Baranī weaves them into an argument which is directly linked to his personal predicaments. His is an intellectual seduction which if successful would benefit him. History is not only essential for the great and the high-born, Baranī argues, but only those who are great and high-born can be interested in history, and for them the historian is a very important person.[96] A causal link between being great, and an interest in history, therefore the necessity for the pampering of the historian, is established. By this logic those not interested in Baranī's work were not great but low-born.

Baranī was no doubt conscious of the importance of his work and of his reputation with posterity. He is convinced of the importance of his work.[97] He says:

> In this book I have worked magic. The scholars of history who have become scarce know that no historian has for a thousand years been able to write a book like this Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī .... (98)

He is contemptuous of people whose books are never sold and are returned by the book sellers to the paper merchants who then wash the paper clean.[99] He did have his eye on the book market no matter how limited this might have been. He talks about how certain religious books sold well because of the influence of the sūfīs.[100] If he was working for his own salvation by writing about religious themes and for the salvation of kings and other Muslims by showing them their 'duties towards Islam', he was also in his work as an author covering the entire spectrum of books that might have been in demand, e.g., a conventional popular type of biography of the Prophet (Thanā'-i Na't-i Muhammadī), and a book dealing with the popular Chistī saint (Hasrat Nāmah). He also translated a popular history (Āl-i Barmakīyān) and wrote one himself.[101]

Baranī, as we have said, completed his Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī sometime around 1357-58. He had intended to write a history beginning from the time of Adam and coming down to his own age. This was in keeping with the tradition of other Muslim historians. As religious men they had thus established a link between their own times and those of the prophets. But Baranī changed his mind. As he says, Minhāj had already written about the period, and Baranī did not want to detract from the worth of his predecessor's work for which he had a high regard.[102] Habib is more uncharitable about the reasons why Baranī did not want to retread the ground that Minhāj had covered. He says:

> ....we must remember that the facts of Islamic history collected by Barani from the fabricated histories then current directly contradicted the Tabaqat-i Nasiri. So Barani wisely decided to begin where the Tabaqat-i Nasiri had ended. (103)

Even if this is partially correct, we have to keep in mind that Baranī's Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī was an important step in the evolution of the historical concerns of the Indian Muslims towards a greater narrowing of interest and a sharper focus of subject. We have noted this evolution and its characteristics in the introduction to this work. Baranī does not totally discard the 'Universal history' format, but he makes a distinct move away from it. He pays respect to the universalist traditions of Islamic historiography by making a mention of the Prophet and giving a short sketch of the first four Caliphs. This he might have done to stress the religious significance of his work. But he quickly moves on to concentrate on an area more relevant to his outlook and concerns, the affairs of the sultanate of Delhi.

Baranī's Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī covers the reign of eight sultans: Ghiyāth al-Dīn Balban, Mu'izz al-Dīn Kayqubād, Jalāl al-Dīn Fīrūz Khaljī, 'Alā' al-Dīn Khaljī, Quṭb al-Dīn Mubārak Khaljī, Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughlaq Shāh, Muḥammad ibn Tughlaq Shāh and the first six years of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq's reign. Nizami feels it probable that he had intended to write two books: one on all the prior sultans and the second exclusively on Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq. He bases this view on what he feels to be a difference of style: Baranī is critical of every one else except Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq.[104] This intention of writing two separate books is unlikely, however, because Baranī himself states in the outset that he wanted to write a history from Adam down to Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq. As for the fact that he 'shamelessly flatters' Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq while he is very critical of others, we will argue in what follows that in his own way Baranī is very critical of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq also. It is also unlikely that Lal is correct in

believing that the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī was written in a casual manner with Baranī working on it from time to time.[105] Baranī would not have had the time to write at leisure because we know of at least eight books that he wrote in approximately six years.

Unlike Minhāj, Baranī is dealing with the political events in just one area. The chapters are therefore based on individual reigns and do not overlap. From Jalāl al-Dīn Khaljī onwards he ~~divides~~ the chapters into various headings. But these sub-divisions do not follow any particular pattern and indicate that the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī is not very well planned. At the beginning of each chapter he gives the list of royal princes and various nobles of the various reigns. When he comes to Fīrūz Shāh he divides the reign into eleven muqadimmahs (he had intended to write one hundred and one) dealing with the general characteristics of the reign.

Hardy classifies both the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī and the Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī as exemplifying the didatic form of historical writing,[106] calling them the "reverse and obverse of the same ideological coin".[107] Baranī's socio-political thought is expressed in the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī through the technique of 'oratio-recta' where various characters in his history speak their thoughts on various subjects. He records various conversations: between Balban and his sons Muḥammad and Bughrā Khān; between Bughrā Khān and his son Kayqubād; between kotwāl Fakhr al-Dīn and his nephew Niẓām al-Dīn; between Jalāl al-Dīn Khaljī and Malik Aḥmad Chap; between 'Alā' al-Dīn Khaljī and Baranī's uncle 'Alā' al-Mulk; 'Alā' al-Dīn Khaljī and Qāḍī Mughīth al-Dīn; and between Baranī and Muḥammad ibn Tughlaq. Hardy in his discussion of the oratio

recta technique of Baranī has pointed out how Baranī was expressing his own thoughts through other people. Baranī, Hardy points out, was neither a 'tape recorder' nor a 'cabinet secretary'.[108] Hardy also goes on to show the remarkable similarity between the opinions expressed in the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī and those of the Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī where they are supposed to have been the advice of Maḥmūd of Ghaznah. In the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī we can very often detect Baranī's views being expressed on both sides of an argument as is in the case of the conversation between Jalāl al-Dīn Khaljī and Aḥmad Chap.[109]

The Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī is more obviously didatic in character than the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī. Ostensibly it is meant to be a series of lectures on statecraft delivered by Maḥmūd of Ghaznah[110] to his sons. The nature of this work, the first major one of its kind produced in Delhi, had its precedents. Fakhr-i Mudabbir had introduced the ideas of Niẓām al-Mulk's Siyāsat Nāmah through his work, Ādāb al-Mulūk.[111] And who could Baranī have chosen as the ideal Muslim king other than Maḥmūd of Ghaznah, the 'idol smasher'.[112]

Nizami believes, on the basis of internal evidence, that the Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī was written after the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī.[113] Hardy agrees with him.[114] A. S. Khan feels that Baranī wanted to remain anonymous regarding the authorship of the Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī and therefore pretended that it was written by a courtier of Maḥmūd of Ghaznah. She holds that since Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq had ignored the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī, Baranī wanted to pass judgement on him in this work and therefore did not dedicate this book to him.[115] It is not clear what she thinks Baranī would have gained by this action. Since Baranī was

trying to pass off his own political convictions as those of Maḥmūd, they would not have sounded credible if he had made it obvious that they were written three centuries after Maḥmūd's death. Furthermore, dedicating the Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī to Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq would have immediately put the authenticity of his treatise in doubt.

The only copy of the Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī that is known to have survived is in very poor shape.[116] Apart from being badly damaged and carelessly copied, it is incomplete, and there seems to have been attempts made at altering it. A. S. Khan estimates that it is composed of twenty-four naṣā'iḥ (advices).[117] The advices usually begin with an invocation to the 'sons of Maḥmūd and the kings of Islam' to follow the general principle that has been stated and is followed by one or more anecdotes to illustrate this advice. These advices and illustrations very often tend to ramble. Often Baranī's own statements from the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī tend to reappear in the mouth of one of the characters in the Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī. An example is the discussion on punishments.[118]

The Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī and the Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī might be the 'obverse and reverse' of the same ideological coin, but they obviously were not received in the same way by contemporaries, if Baranī's own statement about the quality of books being judged by whether they were sold or their paper was washed and used again affords any evidence. Only one copy of the Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī is known to have survived, and one of Baranī's contemporaries of near contemporaries seems to have known about it or to have considered it worth citing. Lees points out the existence of a number of copies of the Ta'rīkh-i

Firūz Shāhī which were detroyed in the disturbances of 1857,[119] and yet a number of copies are still available.[120] The pomposity and the irrelevance of the views expressed in the Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī must have been the reason for the complete absence of interest of Baranī's contemporaries in it. Nigam's hypothesis that it was most probably used as a theoretical reading for the training of the nobility[121] is simply not supported by facts. The book does not represent the actual political theory of the sultanate of Delhi but what Baranī wished that the political theory of the Sultans had been.[122]

There are obvious similarities between the Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī and the Siyāsat Nāmah.[123] Hardy in a poineering study has tried to place the Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī in a 'larger Islamic context' by comparing it with al-Ghazālī's Nasīhat al-Mulūk and Kīmiya al-Saʻādah and Nasīr al-Dīn Tūsī's Akhlāq-i Nāsirī.[124] It is not within the scope of this work to examine the validity of Hardy's claim that in the "constellation of early medieval Muslim writers on the ideal ruler, Baranī can be seen to shine forth as an eastern star".[125] But Hardy admits that there are differences in emphasis if not in approach among them. This is only natural considering that each one of them was responding to very different historical situations. Baranī's own views were directly a result of the environment in which he lived. A brief examination of Baranī's political thought would be relevant at this stage.

Baranī's entire political thought resembles what Hardy describes as a "cry of anguish by a man who knows that his religious ideals and the times are out of joint".[126] He admits, both in the Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī and in the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī that monarchy is un-Islamic.

The handling of government can be done only in the traditions of the Persian kings which is totally antithetical to the examples of the Prophet.[127] Power corrupts, and only the four rightly guided caliphs were ideal rulers because they were able to combine poverty, humility and kingship.[128] Having asserted this, he makes the best of this situation by insisting that kingship, in importance, comes only after the Prophetic office[129] and that jahāndārī is the khilāfat of God.[130] It is not the king's fault that he cannot live according to true Islamic ideals because it is the world which is too wicked to allow this. Those who have tried, like the first four caliphs, have failed. Did not three of the four get killed?[131]

Kingship being un-Islamic, the king has to make an extra effort for his own salvation. Simple piety and religiosity are not enough. Saying a thousand rak'ats of prayers, constant fasting, not going near anything that is forbidden, spending the treasury for the sake of God, all do not guarantee deliverance. What can save the king from hell is Dīn Panāhī.[132] Shaykh Nūr al-Dīn Ghaznawī, the Shaykh al-Islām of Iltutmish is quoted by Balban to show what Dīn Panāhī is:

1. The king should protect Islam, use the power of his office for the cause of his religion by enforcing the sharī'ah and by not tolerating kāfirī and shirk. Kufr and Kāfirs should be overthrown, but if this is not possible because of their numbers, they should be humiliated. A good Muslim king gets into a rage when he sees a Hindu because the Hindus are the worst enemies of the Prophet. All Brahmans should be killed. Hindus should not be able to get a job.

2. Immorality of all kinds should be suppressed. Prostitution is

wicked but if the prostitutes agree to carry on their trade covertly, they should be allowed to exist because otherwise the virtue of good Muslim women would be endangered.

3. Government work should be entrusted to pious, religious men. Philosophers and rationalists should not find a place in the government.

4. The king should maintain a high standard of justice.[133]

Since kingship is the viceroyalty of God, it is essential. What advice does Baranī have for the maintenance of this institution? The most important elements according to him are khawf (fear), haybat and hishmat (reverence, majesty, pomp, grandeur).[134] The awe that these inspire is irreplaceable and cannot be acquired either through love or harsh punishments.[135] If the populace is not in awe and fear, the Hindus will become rebellious and the Muslims irreligious. Strong rule is synonymous with the religiosity of the people. Baranī made Qāḍī Mughīth al-Dīn crticise 'Alā' al-Dīn, in the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī, for spending public money on his personal needs.[136] In the Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī he provides a way out for the ruler by admitting that it is essential for the ruler to spend from the public treasury in order to maintain his image and stature, but he should be careful not to spend the money on his personal pleasures.[137] How one draws a line between the two, he does not say.

Also essential to the strength of the Sultan is the army.[138] Along with wealth, horses and elephants are the bases of kingship.[139] And this army should never be kept idle.

One of the conditions for a king's success is that he should be of strong determination and that he should not vacillate.[141] But

there is nothing sacrosanct about royal orders, and they can be abrogated if they are not working; for after all, even God abrogated parts of the Qur'ān.[142] Since the sharī'ah does not provide for this situation, the king is supposed to propogate dawābit or state laws: "laws on which knowledge and reason agree".[143] The legislation of these dawābit has to be guided by certain considerations: they should not contradict the sharī'ah, and they should be based on the examples of pious kings. If forbidden things have to be legislated, then alms should be distributed to make up for it.[144]

The king in order to make wise laws has to depend on counsellors who should have the freedom to express themselves freely without fear. The counsellors also should be permanent and be privy to all state secrets.[145]

The king has to be just. He should not make any difference between the rich and the poor as far as justice is concerned.[146] Justice is important because without it private property is not safe, and trade does not flourish.[147]

The people will also not love and respect their king if he cannot provide for their livelihood.[148] Bughrā Khān is quoted in the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī as saying that a king cannot be considered a king if in his reign even one person is naked or hungry.[149]

A king should be strict with any signs of disaffection if they should manifest themselves in open rebellion. A king should constantly be aware of what is happening in his kingdom through a system of Barīds[150] (informers). Baranī condemns Jalāl al-Dīn Khaljī through the words of Ahmad Chap for not being strict enough with the rebel

Malik Chajjū.[151] But then the king should be careful not to be too severe. His punishments should not be too extreme, and he should not harbour grudges.[152] Pursuit of grudges can lead to his downfall as happened with the case of Muḥammad ibn Tughlaq. Disobedience to the king should not be punished by death. The death penalty should be used only when the state is harmed. Baranī lists six other instances in which the death penalty can be imposed: apostacy, murder, adultery, intention to rebel against the king, helping rebels and helping the enemies of the king. Baranī admits that only three of these bases of the death penalty, those for murder, adultery and apostacy, were sanctioned by the Prophet.[153] Baranī finally recommends that if a king is unpopular he should abdicate.[154]

Baranī's biases and prejudices become very clear in his socio-political thought. These not only dictated his political attitudes but very often reflect his personal grudges. They can also be taken as indicating the concerns of the class that he came from.

Though essentially a conservative, Baranī sometimes displays a liberal streak. After criticising Quṭb al-Dīn Mubārak Shāh as a debauchee, Baranī praises him for his good deeds such as the release of 'Alā' al-Dīn's political prisoners and the relaxation of revenue demands.[155] He severely condemns the brutality with which 'Alā' al-Dīn suppressed the revolt of the new Muslims.[156] But on the whole, Baranī's thought conformed with the insecurities of an established ruling class which saw the basis of its privilege being slowly eaten away by encroachers. He stoutly believed that the ideal Islamic society was a hierarchic one ".... with mankind graded into various classes. The function of the

government was to maintain a just balance between various classes".[157]

Baranī's obsession with 'birth' indicates how concerned he was at the phenomenon of people succeeding in spite of not being high-born Turks. As far as he was concerned, the low-born did not exist. In spite of proclaiming that he had written a history for mankind, he is quick to point out the his Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī is not about the low-born and that they will not benefit from reading it.[158] For him, kam asl (base-born) is synonymous with radhīl (mean, vile), bikār (useless, worthless), kamīnah (base abject) and past himmat (mean spirited).[159] The low-born should not be given any appointments, and Iltutmish and Balban are praised for their attitude towards those not born in the right families. Jalāl al-Dīn also comes in for praise for he saw to it that the low-born did not rise to power.[160] Muhammad ibn Tughlaq comes in for severe disapprobation for raising the bad asl (base-born) to high offices. Baranī is horrified that a wine-merchant, a barber, a gardener, a musician, and a cook were given royal appointments.[161] Trying to find a rationale for this 'unreasonable' behaviour of Muhammad ibn Tughlaq, he finds a scapegoat in the philosophers with whom the Sultan spent so much time. Baranī assures us that Muhammad ibn Tughlaq otherwise hated the low-born as much as he did.[162] It was under the influence of these rationalists that Muhammad ibn Tughlaq not only appointed the low-born but also killed Muslims.[163] Baranī therefore advises future Muslim kings to persecute these philosophers because they are anti-Muslim.[164] Baranī is convinced that if Ibn-i Sīnā had fallen into Mahmūd of Ghaznah's hands, Mahmūd would have had him butchered and fed to the kites.[165]

Baranī was obviously alarmed at the rise of the non-high born and of converts, and like many others of his class must have suffered some sort of displacement. Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughlaq was great because he did not raise new families nor did he ruin established ones.[166] His reign was also safe for private property.[167] Baranī is acutely conscious that even though the philsophers are a convenient scapegoat for blame, so far as social mobility was concerned, the actual danger lay elsewhere. He advises that teachers should not "thrust precious stones down the throats of dogs or put collars of gold around the necks of pigs or bears".[168] By teaching them skills such as reading and writing, the low-born are equipped to get employment as revenue collectors, accountants, etc., and this is socially unhealthy.[169] People give up their old professions and take up new ones. This causes social upheaval. Baranī says that all professions should therefore be fixed.[170]

If the newly converted were rising and threatening the social position of the old, established families, Baranī is aware that the financial security of the latter was being challenged also from another side. In this matter, Baranī mouths the fear of the ruling élite whose economic position rested on the surplus extracted from land. This feudally based élite felt threatened by and resentful of the merchants and any increase in their wealth. Baranī calls the merchants the worst of all classes.[171] Since social position depended on wealth and the Hindu shopkeepers made money from the Muslims, the king should enforce price-control.[172] Baranī's condemnation of usury is not based just on religious considerations. The Muslim nobility, often living

beyond their means, were getting deeper and deeper into debt. Baranī mentions how some nobles, trying to outdo each other in generosity, would get into debts with merchants and money-lenders who became rich from the money of these iqṭā'dārs who borrowed funds, putting up their iqṭā's as security.[173] He also bemoans how, towards the end of his life, he, the son of a well-known and generous family, could not get credit from anyone.[174]

Baranī also exhibits strong racial and communal prejudices. He derides Chajjū Khislī Khān's forces as an army of 'rice and fish-eaters',[175] and condemns 'Alā' al-Dīn's murder of his uncle as an act not even befitting a Jew or a Zoroastrian.[176] He refers to the Ismā'īlīs as ibāhitīs[177] (people of license). But the choicest of abuses he reserves for the Hindus. It is not difficult to see why.

As a religious group, the Hindus embodied every other prejudice and insecurity of Baranī and made his fears appear real. His virulent hatred for them had deep reasons, and its causes are not as simple as Lal suggests:

> Barani hated Hindus to please Firuz Shah, he hated Hindus because he derived a cyncial pleasure from hating them. (178)

No single sentence of Baranī indicates his hatred for the Hindus more than the one that he puts into the mouth of Qāḍī Mughīth al-Dīn:

> When a tax-collector demands money from him (a Hindu), the latter in all humility and respect pays the required amount; and if the collector would spit in his (the Hindu's) mouth, the latter should unhesitatingly open his mouth to receive it. (179)

He is sure that if Maḥmūd of Ghaznah had invaded India once again he would have killed all Hindus if they had refused to convert. He

advises the kings that 'truth at the center' can be established only be degrading all the Hindus and killing the Brahmans.[180] But is his hatred for Hindus merely a matter of religious bigotry? Or were there specific social and historical reasons which hardened his bias against them? Baranī had stakes in the continued survival of the sultanate of Delhi, and the rash of rebellions under Muhammad ibn Tughlaq must have frightened him. This might explain his equating a Hindu with a rebel.[181] Apart from this, the usurpation of the throne by a new Muslim, Khusraw Khān, his subsequent apostacy and the desecration of mosques and the Qur'ān (as Baranī describes them), must have confirmed Baranī's fears regarding Hindus and converts.[182] His own poverty stricken condition where he had to depend on the charity of others to survive must have made the prosperity of some Hindus around him seem unfair. He reflects this when he says that the Sultans of Delhi were neglecting their duties if:

> they bestow drum, banners, ornaments, cloaks of brocades, and caparisoned horses upon them; if they appoint them to governorships and high posts and offices; and if in their capital.... they allow them to build houses like palaces, to wear clothes of brocade, and to ride Arab horses caparisoned with gold and silver ornaments, to be equipped with a thousand sources of strength, to live among delights and comforts, to take Muslims into their service and to make them run before their horses, with poor Muslims begging of them.... (183)

Baranī uses the word Hindu indiscriminately, and this carelessness of usage and failure to make a distinction between the class of Hindus he did not like and the Hindus in general has led to problems. Several modern Indian historians of medieval India have taken advantage of the grudges that Baranī bore against rebellious or rich Hindus to distort history and to make it fit in with their own

views. Baranī's glee at the suffering of Hindu intermediaries caused by 'Alā' al-Dīn's revenue arrangements has led Majumdar to say that these reforms were motivated primarily by 'Alā' al-Dīn's hatred for the Hindus.[184] Based primarily on Baranī's views A. L. Srivastava extends this interpretation to the entire sultanate, which, according to him was "an Islamic state, pure and simple, and gave no toleration to the Hindus".[185]

Moreland has shown how carelessly Baranī uses the term 'Hindu'.[186] What Baranī actually meant by the word Hindu in the context of 'Alā' al-Dīn's revenue reforms were the khawts and the muqaddams, the rural intermediaries, who by keeping a share of the revenue were getting rich, and not the Hindus in general. The Hindus formed the bulk of the peasantry,[187] and they must have benefited from 'Alā' al-Dīn's revenue reforms. Baranī also refers to the peasants as the khāzinān-i bayt al-māl-i Musalmānān (keepers of the treasury of the Muslims).[188] He recommends the suspension of jizyah[189] and the distribution of charity when the crops fail.[190] He also says that if the king's faith is correct, the life and honour of his subjects, both Muslims and dhimmīs will be safe.[191] He praises Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughlaq for not making excessive demands on the peasants,[192] and for being concerned with the welfare of both Hindus and Muslims.[193] He condemns Ilyās for oppressing Muslims and dhimmīs.[194]

Baranī's worth and accuracy as a historian can be judged only after we see how he wrote his history; what sources he used for his information and how he used these sources. Habib, with some conviction, feels that he wrote entirely from memory with no notes or books.[195]

Lal feels that Baranī's Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī was written after "consulting all available and trustworthy documents on different periods".[196] A. S. Khan commends the use of 'original sources' by him.[197] But the overwhelming number of references in his Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī are to hearsay testimony. Known for his talents as a storyteller, Baranī obviously had a well-trained memory, and it is likely that he used all the information that he had gathered and which he now remembered, to construct his history. It is very unlikely that he had any reference materials available to him in view of the dire straits in which he wrote his works. Nizami asserts that the only way the lists of nobles and the principal officers in the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī can be explained is on the basis that Baranī either had some recorded data available to him at the time of writing or if they were added on later.[198] Nizami might be correct, but we would be underestimating the traditions of oral history and Baranī's memory if we accepted this view. As has been stated earlier, Baranī does not seem to have had recorded data available to him. Regarding the suggestion that he had added the lists later, the question arises as to where Baranī would have found such lists even if we presume that such lists existed. He did not have any contact with the official circles where such records might have been kept.

Baranī had spent a life reading popular histories and literature. He speaks of how hard he had had to work to acquire this knowledge.[199] But the sources that he uses for the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī are practically all oral. He does mention a lot of books as sources but only in the Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī. He quotes Amīr Khusraw but quotes only his

poems and never goes to his historical works for information which he himself might not have had, e.g., 'Alā' al-Dīn's wars in Chittor, Ranathambhor and Malwa.[200]

For the regin of Balban and Kayqubād he bases his information on what he heard from his father and grandfather.[201] He also often mentions his maternal grandfather as an authority.[202] For the reign of the Khaljī's he himself was an eyewitness even though he was only five when the dynasty began.[203] He frequently asserts 'I saw'[204] or 'I remember'.[205] What makes his sources suspicious are the generalised hearsay statements that he attributes to various people. Usually he refers to hearing about a particular event from 'wise and learned people',[206] or from 'trustworthy people',[207] or from 'aged nobles'.[208] Sometimes he is more specific. He mentions having heard things from Amīr Khusraw,[209] Amīr Ḥasan,[210] Khwājah Ḍakī,[211] Malik Qīrā Beg,[212] or from Qāḍī Sharf al-Dīn.[213]

In the Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī he cites a list of authorities to support his illustrations. Some of the books that he mentions are: Ta'rīkh-i Khulafā'-i 'Abbāsī,[214] Ma'āthir-i 'Umar,[215] the history of al-Wāqidī,[216] Ibn Isḥāq's biography of the Prophet,[217] Ta'rīkh-i Ma'āthir-i Ṣaḥābah of Imām Ismā'ī,[218] Ma'āthir al-Wuzarā',[219] Ta'rīkh-i Akāsira (Kisrāwī?),[220] Ta'rīkh-i Ma'āthir-i Ṣaḥābah of Imām Muḥammad Isḥāq,[221] Kitāb-i Ma'āthir-i Khulafā',[222] Ta'rīkh-i Khwārazm Shāhī,[223] Shahr al-Sunnah,[224] Ta'rīkh-i Sanjarī,[225] Ta'rīkh-i Ghadr al-Sirr,[226] Tarīkh-i Nawshīrwān,[227] and Ta'rīkh-i Ummam.[228] Habib and A. S. Khan have investigated the authenticity of these sources.[229] One is left with the impression that even if there were books with the titles he has mentioned, if

they were extant and available to him and if Baranī had read them at some stage of his life, he was not very exact in quoting the information these books offered. This has led Habib to charge that Baranī relied mainly on fabricated histories.[230] Whereas in the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī he could get away with saying that he had himself seen something or that he had heard about it from a reliable person, in the Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī he needed to cite names and histories to make the book look credible. Baranī, in the Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī wanted to make a point, not educate his readers. The references therefore fulfil the function of illustrating the views Baranī wanted to propound and not that of substantiating historical occurences.

If Baranī's attitude towards his sources does not satisfy our standards, he was not being very different from his contemporaries in this respect. He insists right in the beginning of his work that historical data is not based on isnād.[231] This is an obvious contradiction in Baranī which he fails to notice. He has stated elsewhere that history and hadīth are twins. But he does not apply the methodology of usūl-i isnād to both.[232] As long as he had the word of an honest, God-fearing person for something, he could trust the information as reliable. This attitude was totally subjective and fitted in with Baranī's view of what he wanted to do in history. Baranī, as Mujeeb feels, saw himself an an interpreter rather than as a chronicler who wanted to educate rather than inform.[233]

Baranī very often lapses into religious terminology such as the 'armies of Islam' crushing the 'hordes of unbelievers',[234] but this is only empty rhetoric. While he might have had a strong sense of

religion, he does not treat history as a branch of theology as Hardy thinks he does. According to Hardy, Baranī "sees the past as a battle ground between good and evil and men as combatants upon that field of battle. Baranī treats history as a branch of theology."[235]

It is true that Baranī often moralises. But if we were to accept Hardy's characterisation of Baranī's history as only a branch of theology, we would in fact be denying Baranī's work its worth as a historical source. Hardy pre-supposes a pattern of the _Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī_, it being a 'medieval morality play', and then tries to fit Baranī's history into his own conception of it. History for Baranī was more than a battle ground between the forces of good and evil. It was the immediate past which he was trying to figure out for himself and for his readers. And the factors that had affected this past were not the forces of virtue or sin but more material ones such as the policies of the rulers. The rulers in his history did not fail because they were sinners or immoral men but because of their political actions which might have been directly linked to their personal characters or shortcomings. The 'morality' in the _Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī_, if we can use this concept at all, is the morality of political common-sense and expediency as Baranī perceived it.

True, Baranī at times reduces causation to Divine pleasure as when he explains the reason for Mahmūd's success by saying that it came about because Mahmūd was a good Muslim.[236] Similarily he says that 'Alā' al-Dīn succeeded because the saint Nizām al-Dīn lived during his reign.[237] But he is also aware of wider political forces. He does believe that righteousness and religiosity are very important for a

king's success, but he is also aware that a king's policies are vital.

He was pleased with Balban's emphasis on 'high-birth'[238] and his strong sense of justice.[239] But he also shows how his policies were harmful. He condemns Balban for reducing Sultan Nāṣir al-Dīn to a namūnah (figure-head) and setting a dangerous precedent.[240] He is critical of Balban's severe measures against the nobility and the brutal elimination of the trustworthy nobles which created problems for his dynasty. The responsibility for Kayqubād's irresolute behaviour is also laid upon Balban. Balban's extremely severe upbringing of the young prince made it only natural that he would go overboard once this strict supervision was removed.[241] The moral pomposity that Baranī often exhibits does not always mar his astute and practical observations. Having condemned the corruption of Niẓām al-Dīn, Baranī blames Kayqubād for trying to dismiss him when he did not have an alternative as wazīr, a step which just made the situation worse.[242]

Baranī's attitude towards causation in history is best exemplified in his treatment of the reign of ʿAlā' al-Dīn, the reign which he deals with most comprehensively. He feels that ʿAlā' al-Dīn's reforms, particularly his revenue reforms and his market regulations, were needed for the security of the empire. The Sultan had to have a large army to defend his realms from the Mongol threat and from internal insurrection.[243] For maintaining a large standing army, money was needed: he had to bring down prices so that he did not have to pay the soldiers too much and so that the army would not cost too much.[244] Through his revenue re-organisation, not only would more money be raised but also the rural aristocracy would be deprived of the economic resources which

make rebellion possible.[245] In the case of Muḥammad ibn Tughlaq, he disagreed with the Sultan's various schemes as wrong and misguided economic policies, citing the harm that resulted from each. He treats the reign first as a series of wrong policies and then considers the results of these policies. He point out how the rebellions were an outcome of the Sultan's schemes which were the result of the advice given by bad advisors.[246]

Baranī's Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī suffers from serious defects. The basic one is that of chronology. This could be the result of the conditions under which he wrote. He seldom mentions any dates; and when he does, they are quite often wrong. He gives the year of Balban's accession as 662 H. when it was 664 H; Kayqubād's accession is placed in the year 685 H. instead of 686 H. and Jalāl al-Dīn's in 688 H. instead of 689 H.[247]

But is doubtful if Baranī was concerned about chronology at all. He himself stated:

> I have not cared as to which victory, rebellion or event came first and which came later, and I have not adhered to the chronological sequence of events, so that wise men may obtain warning and wisdom by observing events in their totality. (248).

Not being inclined or in a position to check the accuracy of his dates, he remembers only those events or information that were joined in some sort of a causal link and which had made an impression on him. Baranī is totally subjective, and he admits this.

More misleading is his technique of recording conversations as if he had been present and as if he has a transcript of the conversation.[249] Very much like "the Greek historian, Thucydides, who purports to have been the mouth-piece of the intelligentsia of

Greece",[250] this dramatisation of history makes it very readable. But one has to be constantly aware that the various characters are saying what Baranī thinks they might have said or what he wishes they had said.

How are we supposed to treat these conversations? Should we dismiss them as 'imaginary' or take them at their face value? The temptation of availing themselves of the ready-made 'political theory' that Baranī offers has been too much for some modern scholars to resist, often against their own better judgement. Hardy has pointed out this ambivalence in the case of Habibullah.[251] Nizami, too, on the basis of the sermon purported to have been delivered by Balban goes ahead to define Balban's 'Theory of Kingship'.[252] Majumdar also unquestioningly accepts Baranī's words as actually those of whoever is reported to have said them and goes on to quote the now infamous words of Qāḍī Mughīth al-Dīn who according to Majumdar "agreed whole-heartedly and justified 'Alā' al-Dīn's religious policy towards the Hindus and pointed out that Islamic law sanctioned sterner principles". Majumdar says this after having earlier admitted that Baranī had put his own words into other people's mouths.[253] Lal too finds no problem in taking whichever view suits his mood or specific argument. He disagrees with Hardy over the latter's doubt regarding these alleged conversations.[254] Elsewhere he firmly asserts that "the injunctions of Qazi Muhghis are nothing but Baranī's own views."[255] But again, in a highly polemical and emotionally charged essay on the 'Nature of the Muslim State in India' Lal comes back to the point whence he had started and insists that "Mughis had spoken to Alauddin in the early years

of the fourteenth century. It is clear that the humiliation of the <u>Zimmi</u> was then well known in theory if not in practice".[256] Nizami too can use Baranī for both sides of an argument. After blaming Baranī for having caused all the misunderstandings regarding 'Alā' al-Dīn's religious views, he uses the same conversation reported by Baranī to prove otherwise.[257]

One has to be clear about the nature of these conversations and how Baranī wanted to use them. There can be no doubt that, except for the conversations between Baranī and Muhammad ibn Tughlaq, that Baranī was in no position to have heard what was said so as to report it accurately, provided such conversations had ever taken place. There are four aspects to these conversations that have to be born in mind. First, using arguments, dialogues and sermons was a stylistic technique employed by Baranī to make his history more readable and to enliven it. Secondly, since Baranī's expressed purpose is to educate his readers, conversations are a convenient way of presenting what for Baranī were the dialectics of history: two opposing viewpoints regarding matters of state and religion. Examples of the latter were Ahmad Chap's telling Jalāl al-Dīn that his policy towards disobedience and rebellion was not wise or of Qadī Mughīth al-Dīn's telling the king of the religious duties of the Sultan and 'Alā' al-Dīn's replying that State and religion were two distinct entities. Thirdly, Baranī used the technique of the <u>oratio-recta</u> to give his interpretation of the rulers and their attitudes. He assigns them a larger world view on the basis of his own reading of their characters and attitudes. Thus Balban's ruthlessness is transformed into a larger 'theory of kingship' based on pomp, awe, and

might. 'Alā' al-Dīn's failure to show overt signs of subservience to the 'ulamā' is interpreted as an illiterate's lack of regard for the sharī'ah. Finally, there can be no doubt that Baranī uses these occasions to pass on his own views, for example, making Jalāl al-Dīn Khaljī sound apologetic for being king because he did not have a king in his pedigree.[258] As has been pointed out earlier, the similarity between what various people say in the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī and the advices in the Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī confirm this view. Therefore, while these conversations, etc., are a good indication of the working of the historian's mind, they cannot be taken at their face value.

Day has shown the misinterpretations that are likely if Baranī's account of 'Alā' al-Dīn's market regulations are taken too literally.[259] Baranī's selective treatment of the history of the reign of Muḥammad ibn Tughlaq gives us a distorted picture of the Sultan. While Elliot accuses Baranī of hiding the "atrocious means of perfidy and murder by which Muhammad Tughlik obtained the throne",[260] Habibullah accuses Baranī of being biased against Muḥammad ibn Tughlaq because he sympathised with the ecclesiastics who were opposed to the king.[261] Baranī himself admits that he has been selective in his treatment of the Sultan's reign,[262] and that he did not understand Muḥammad ibn Tughlaq.[263] His only concern with the history of Muahmmad ibn Tughlaq were the reasons for the latter's failure. And this concern is not unnatural if we remember that Baranī spent the best years of his life under that ruler.

While Minhāj was simplistic in his ideas of the lessons history taught, Baranī is very sophisticated about them. He has more of a sense of real-politik. He makes Balban say that a king should not

attempt something unless he is sure that he will succeed.[264] There are other interesting pieces of advice, too. For example, Bughrā Khān's telling his son that a king should not have too many children. Too many contenders for the throne leads to fratricide.[265] A king is also advised not to destroy the existing governing class when he replaces a dynasty because then the reconciliation to his rule becomes more difficult.[266] A king is also told that he should wage jihād only when his own territory (mamlakat-i khāṣṣ) is fully under control.[267] Baranī is impartial in his criticisms when he does not approve of something. He condemns his uncle for having been involved in the murder of Jalāl al-Dīn Khaljī.[268]

Baranī has a much wider historical perspective than Minhāj. Minhāj connects events only chronologically and never draws any notice to trends or connections between one period and another. Baranī reviews every reign at the end of each chapter and often stops to trace the evolution of one trend in the history of the sultanate of Delhi, for example, what the attitude of various sultans was towards punishment.[269] He also gives us more than political information, including in his work matters of revenue administration and other administrative details, lists of saints, doctors, poets, nobles, etc.

The defects in Baranī's work are the result of two things. First, his biases get in the way of what is very often acute political observation. The best example is his treatment of the ḍawābit. He is given credit for being "the first theoretician to justify secular laws among the Muslim, and he deserves full credit for this achievement."[270] True, Baranī accepts that new laws beyond the pale of the sharī'ah

have to be framed and that these often have to go against accepted religious practices. But at the same time Baranī, who must have been aware of many major contraventions of the sharī'ah can give us only the example of prostration before kings.[271] And the best example of dabt that he can give us is that the low-born should not be given jobs.[272]

The second weakness arises from Baranī's own situation. He was never an 'insider' except for a short period of time. It is true that he was a close observer and must have had sufficient contacts to know what was happening. But information, by the time it filtered down to him, could often have taken on a new colouring. Hambly has mentioned one such instance.[273] He has shown how the possible existence of a number of freed slave commanders under Iltutmish was given an extra dimension by Baranī when he talked of them as the chihilgānī or in the parlance of modern historians, the 'corps of forty'. Baranī may have just been repeating what might have been a popular way of refering to the slave commanders, and modern historians have been led into believing that there was such an institution deliberately set up by Iltutmish.

How does Baranī rate according to the standards he has set up for himself? A historian, he says, must mention the unsavoury aspects of a king if he mentions his excellences, virtues, kindnesses, etc.[274] He claims to have written such a history, mentioning both aspects of each reign, because he is convinced that otherwise people would not believe him.[275] He criticises Kabīr al-Dīn's Fatah Nāmah for being too flattering of 'Alā' al-Dīn and thinks it was so because it was presented to the king, making it impossible for Kabīr al-Dīn to be honest in what he said.[276] But is Baranī himself guilty of the same offense?

Is he living up to his own standards and is he not being extra charitable to Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq? Ostensibly, he has nothing but praise for Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq, leading Elliot to say:

> in the weakness of old age, or in the desire to please the reigning monarch, he has indulged in a strain of adulation which spoils his narrative. (77)

So uncritical does he seem of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq that even an astute commentator on Baranī such as Peter Hardy has been lead to imagine that the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī was written on a grand, pre-conceived design. He describes the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī as a:

> medieval morality play, as a symposium of one-act melodramas, one for each reign except for Firuz Shah Tughlaq's when the perfect age had dawned. (78)

Does Baranī really want us to come away from the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī with the impression that at the accession of Fīrūz Shāh the perfect age had been ushered in? On the surface it could very well seem so. Baranī has no apparent criticism of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq. But Baranī himself realised that being critical of a ruling monarch is difficult, as he points out in the case of Kabīr al-Dīn. And was this difficulty not more acute in the case of a monarch such as Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq who on the bases of 'gossip' and 'tale carriers' had reduced him to a nobody? Baranī provides a way out of this dilemma: between the historian's duty to tell the truth and the necessity for the historian to save his own skin.

If a historian cannot say openly what he wants, Baranī has written, he should say what he has to say through hints and insinuations, and the wise will surely understand.[279] Should we then not try to see whether Baranī is trying to pass a judgement on Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq in

the way he has passed judgements on all the other Sultans? Or should we leave the matter as it is and agree with Habib that Baranī praises Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq for things that he criticises in others?[280]

Baranī insists that it is only the high-born who revere the historian because it is through the historian that they and their actions live on.[281] The 'Abbāssids were high-born, therefore, they were interested in history, and the historians prospered under them. In that age, Baranī tells us, when only sons of kings could become kings, the sons of wazīrs, wazīrs, and the sons of maliks, maliks, historians were given stipends, villages, etc.[282] He then bemoans how in his own time (the reign of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq one should remember), no one is interested in history.[283] He complains that if any of the great rulers such as Jamshēd, Ka'īkhusraw, Nawshīrwān-i 'Ādil, Parwez or Maḥmūd of Ghaznah were alive, he would surely have been appreciated.[284] Could not this be an indictement of the existing ruler, the son of a Hindu mother and one whose wazīr was a convert from Hinduism?[285] This ruler who had neither the sagacity, nor the tast (dhawq) to appreciate Baranī's work.[286] Elsewhere too, he tells us of the lack of 'greats' during his own time when he expresses regret that the great ones of 'Alā' al-Dīn's time were not appreciated by him. This regret becomes even more bitter when he looks around him and can see only the mediocre.[287]

Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq also does not come out very favourably in Baranī's work when compared with other monarchs. Ghiyāth al-Dīn, Baranī tells us, saw to it that none of his well-wishers were ever in need or forced to live on credit.[288] And had Baranī not proved himself to be a well-wisher of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq by dedicating his

work to the king, writing a flattering account of him and constantly praying for the continuation of his rule? Jalāl al-Dīn Khaljī, in spite of not having what was necessary to make a successful ruler, never took away a person's status and never dishonoured anyone.[289] For if he had taken away people's stipends and property, no one would have trusted him.[190] And here was Baranī, deprived of his wealth and honour, a good life his birth-right, without even the basic means of livelihood.

Baranī's praise for the organisation of the army under Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq cannot be read as anything but sarcastic. He who had insisted elsewhere that a well-trained, efficient and powerful and constantly active army was essential for the state now informs us of how 'wonderful' things were in the reign of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq when the descriptiverolls had been discarded, when officers presented their personal servants and retainers as soldiers at the time of muster and then proceeded to pocket their pay, and when people were paid for just sitting at home.[291] To believe for a moment that Baranī is citing these instances as a compliment to Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq is to underestimate Baranī's intellect and to do him great injustice.

Similarly he praises Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq for the prosperity of the khawts and muqaddams, the destruction of whom by 'Alā' al-Dīn had so delighted him.[292] Baranī's condemnation of the destructive role that the ghulāms of Iltutmish had played after him could also be seen as a crticism of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq who had raised this institution to new magnitudes.[293] He also seems to cast aspersions on Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq's religiosity when he fabricates an order of the Caliph

Ma'mūn to the effect that sayyid should have the highest place in the court and that it is unIslamic to degrade a sayyid.[294] It would therefore be unfair to detract from Baranī's credentials as a historian by accusing him of sycophancy towards Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq.

Baranī, no matter what he might have wanted to gain from his efforts, has left behind an invaluable work, unmatched by his contemporaries. It is inconceivable even to imagine doing without it as a source for the period. Even though he says that he has written a history from the time of Balban onwards, he gives illuminating insights into the nature of post-Iltutmish politics. Minhāj has only narrated the political happenings but Baranī gives us his view of the nature of the teething troubles of the sultanate. He takes us through the consolidation of power under Balban; the changing nature of the sultanate under the Khaljīs, particulary under 'Alā' al-Dīn when faced with the threat from the Mongols, the character of the rule underwent changes; and Muhammad ibn Tughlaq's efforts to stem the process of disintegration by using desperate remedies. Of course, one has to be extremely cautious and critical when using Baranī as a source because he is not interested in providing mundane facts such as dates or details of battles. His history is openly subjective. This may create problems if Baranī is taken as an 'authority' for reconstructing the history of medieval India. But his work affords a brilliant view of the working of the mind of an Indian Muslim for me must keep in mind that he was the first medieval historian of any import to have been born in India. The importance of his work is therefore not limited to being a source for political, economic or administrative history, but must extend to any

attempts to study the intellectual history of India. His efforts might not have got Baranī what he wanted but they certainly did bring him immortality.

NOTES

[1]Baranī usually refers to himself as Diyā'-i Baranī in the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī, ed. Saiyid Ahmad Khan, Bibliotheca Indica Series (Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1862), p. 9, 20, 22. Muḥammad ibn Mubārak Kirmānī calls him Diyā' al-Millat al-Dīn, Siyar al-Awliyā' (Delhi: 1302/1885), p. 12. In this thesis he is referred to as Diyā' al-Dīn Baranī, the name by which he is commonly known. There is, however, a more serious difference regarding the nisbah Baranī. The pioneering works on Baranī under the auspices of the Royal Asiatic Society as well as Elliot and Dowson refer to him as Barnī; see W. Nassau Lees, "Materials for the History of India for Six Hundred Years of Muhammdan Rule pervious to the Foundation of the British Indian Empire," Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, n.s. 3 (1867-68): 441, and Henry M. Elliot and John Dowson, The History of India as Told by its Own Historians, vol. 3 (London: Trübner & Co., 1871), p. 93. Peter Hardy refers to him as both Baranī in his Historians of Medieval India: Studies in Indo-Muslim Historical Writing (London: Luzac and Co., 1960), and as Barnī in "Some Studies in Pre-Mughal Historiography," Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon, ed. C. H. Philips (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), p. 119. Mohammad Habib and Afsar Umar Salim Khan call him Barni in the translation of Advices XIV to XXIV of the Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī, and Barani elsewhere in the same monograph, The Political Theory of the Delhi Sultanate (Allahabad: Kitab Mahal, n.d.). The Hindi translation of Shaykh 'Abd al-Rashīd's article on Baranī refers to him as बर्नी, Barnī, Khwājah Diyā' al-Millat al-Dīn Diyā' al-Dīn Barnī, trans. Muḥammad 'Umar (Aligarh: Department of History, Aligarh Muslim University, 1957). I have used Baranī because it is the nisbah of Baran, not Barn. See "Baran" and "Buland Shahr," EI[2].

[2]There is a popular misconception that Baranī "takes up the history just where Tabākāt-i Nāsirī leaves it" (emphasis mine), Elliot and Dowson, The History of India, vol. 3, p. 93; S. A. Rashid, Barnī, p. 17; R. C. Majumdar, gen. ed., The History and Culture of the Indian People, vol. 6: The Delhi Sultanate (Bombay: Bhartiya Vidya Bhavan, 1960), p. 2.

[3]Muḥammad Qāsim Hindū Farishtah, Gulshan-i Ibrāhīmī (also known as Ta'rīkh-i Farishtah); Shams-i Sirāj 'Afīf, Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī; Yaḥyā bin Aḥmad bin 'Abdallah Sirhindī, Ta'rīkh-i Mubārak Shāhī, 'Abd al-Ḥaqq Dihlawī, Akhbār al-Akhyār; 'Abd al-Qādir Badā'ūni, Muntakhab al-Tawārīkh; Nizam al-Dīn Aḥmad Bakhshī, Tabaqāt-i Akbarī.

[4]All references are from the Bibliotheca Indica text (hereafter, Baranī, Ta'rīkh). I have also collated and consulted the following translations of the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī: Elliot and Dowson, The History of India, vol. 3, pp. 97-268; A. R. Fuller, "Translations from the Ta'rīkh i Fīrūz Shāhī ... The Reign of 'Alauddīn i Khiljī," Journal

of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 38, i (1869): 181-220; 39, i (1870): 1-51; P. Whalley, "Translations from the Tārīkh i Fīrūzshāhī ... The Reign of Mu'izz-uddīn," Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 40, i (1871): 185-216; Auckland Colvin, "Translations from the Tarikh i Firuzshahi by Ziauddin of Baran ... The Reign of Sultan Ghiasuddin Tughlaq Shah," Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 40, i (1871): 217-47; the Urdu translation of the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī by S. Moinul Haq (Lahore: Markazī Urdu Board, 1969) and the Hindi translation by Saiyid Athar Abbas Rizvi, A Source Book of Medieval Indian History in Hindi, vol. 2: Ādī Turk Kālīn Bhārat (Aligarh: Department of History, Aligarh Muslim University, 1956), pp. 101-245; vol. 3: Khaljī Kālīn Bhārat (Aligarh: Department of History, Aligarh Muslim University, 1955), pp. 1-148; vol. 4: Tughlaq Kālīn Bhārat, I (Aligarh: Department of History, Aligarh Muslim University, 1956), pp. 1-82; vol. 5: Tughlaq Kālīn Bhārat, II (Aligarh: Aligarh Muslim University, 1957), pp. 1-49.

[5]The Persian text of the Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī has been edited by Afsar Salim Khan (Lahore: University of Punjab, 1972). Translation of the Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī is also included in M. Habib and Khan, Political Theory, and Rizvi, Tughlaq Kālīn, II, pp. 275-325. All references are from the Persian text (hereafter, Baranī, Fatāwā). References from A. S. Khan's introduction to the Persian text, hereafter, Khan, Introduction to Fatāwā. The M. Habib and Khan translation suffers from rather arbitrary editing, rearranging and summarisation. The Persian text, edited by Khan, is very carelessly proof-read (as is very clear with the notes in English). I hope that this has not caused me to misread or misunderstand Baranī's arugments.

[6]E. H. Carr, What is History? (London: Macmillan, 1961, reprint ed., Pelican Books, 1976), p. 23.

[7]U. N. Day, "Some Chronicles and Chroniclers of Medieval India," Some Aspects of Medieval Indian History (New Delhi: Kumar Brothers, 1971), p. 167; Khan, Introduction to Fatāwā, p. 17.

[8]Baranī, Ta'rīkh, p. 573.

[9]Ibid., p. 23.

[10]Ibid., p. 105.

[11]Ibid., pp. 21-22.

[12]Ishtiaq Husain Qureshi might have meen misled by this when he places Baranī's birth in the year 1279, "Muslim India before the Mughals," Cambridge History of Islam, vol. 2, ed. P. M. Holt, A. K. S Lambton and Bernard Lewis (Cambirdge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), p. 11, n. 1.

13. Baranī, Ta'rīkh, p. 41.

14. Khan, Introduction to Fatāwā, p. 17; Rizvi, Ādī Turk Kālīn, p. 101; Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, "Ziya-ud-Din Barani," Historians of Medieval India, ed. Mohibbul Hasan, with a Foreward by Muhammad Mujeeb (Meerut: Meenakshi Prakashan, 1968), p. 39; S. H. Barani, "Ziauddin Barani," Islamic Culture, 12 (1938): 78. S. H. Barani makes Ḥusām al-Mulk the maternal grandfather of Baranī's father.

15. Baranī, Ta'rīkh, p. 41. Moinul Haq, in his Urdu translation of the Ta'rīkh translates this sentence as: " ....from my maternal grandfather, sipahsalār Ḥusām al-Dīn who was the wakīl-i dar and bārbak of Sultan Balban", p. 95. Similarily he translates Baranī's statement "....be jadd-i mādarīn-i mu'allif sipahsālār Ḥusām al-Dīn ki wakīl-i dar-i Malik Bārbak būd", Ta'rīkh, p. 87, as "....to the maternal grandfather of the author (Ḥusām al-Dīn), who was called Malik Bārbak", p. 59.

16. See S. B. P. Nigam, Nobility under the Sultans of Delhi, A.D. 1206-1398 (Delhi: Munshiram Manosharlal), p. 8 and Appendix C.

17. Baranī, Ta'rīkh, p. 87.

18. Ibid., p. 88.

19. M. Habib, Political Theory, p. 144.

20. Baranī, Ta'rīkh, pp. 349-50.

21. Syed Moinul Haq, Barani's History of the Tughlaqs; Being a Critical Study of the Relevant Chapters of the Tarikh i Firuz Shahi (Karachi: Pakistan Historical Society, 1959), p. 2; Rizvi, Ādī Turk Kālīn Bhārat, p. 101; S. H. Barani, "Barani," p. 77.

22. Baranī, Ta'rīkh, p. 257.

23. Ibid., p. 259.

24. A. B. M. Habibullah, The Foundation of Muslim Rule in India (Allahabad: Central Book Depot, 1961), p. 62.

25. Moinul Haq, Introduction to Ta'rīkh, p. 2; S. H. Barani, "Barani," pp. 76-77.

26. Baranī, Ta'rīkh, p. 209.

[27]Ibid., p. 248. It is not clear what the function of these two offices were.

[28]Ibid., pp. 236-37.

[29]Ibid., p. 248.

[30]Ibid., p. 258.

[31]Ibid., pp. 255-59, 269-70.

[32]Ibid., pp. 270-71.

[33]Ibid., pp. 264-71.

[34]Ibid., p. 250.

[35]Ibid., p. 209.

[36]Ibid., p. 130.

[37]i.e., in the reign of Jalāl al-Dīn Khiljī. Ibid., p. 205.

[38]Ibid., pp. 353-40.

[39]Ibid., p. 360. M. Habib rejects Baranī's claim that he had introduced them to each other because both had been attached to the retinue of Sultan Khān-i Shahīd when Baranī was still a child, Political Theory, p. 157, n. 7.

[40]Baranī, Ta'rīkh, pp. 165-66.

[41]Kirmānī, Siyar al-Awliyā', pp. 312-13.

[42]ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq Dihlawī, Akhbār al-Akhyār, quoted in S. A. Rashid, Barnī, p. 29, U. N. Day, "Some Chroniclers," p. 172; and Jagadish Narayan Sarkar, "Personal History of Some Medieval Historians and their Writing," Historians of Medieval India, ed. Mohibbul Hasan, p. 172 feel that Baranī was an introvert. An introverted nadīm seems a contradiction in terms.

[43]Habibullah, Foundation, p. 12.

[44] Kirmānī, Siyar al-Awliyā', p. 313.

[45] Kunwar Mohammad Ashraf, Life and Conditions of the People of Hindustan (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1970), pp. 60-61.

[46] Franz Rosenthal, A History of Muslim Historiography (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968), p. 52.

[47] Ashraf, Life and Conditions, p. 61.

[48] Kirmānī, Siyar al-Awliyā', p. 313.

[49] Baranī, Ta'rīkh, p. 504.

[50] Ibid., p. 467.

[51] Ibid., pp. 509-13.

[52] Ibid., pp. 520-21.

[53] Ibid., p. 517.

[54] Ibid., p. 466.

[55] Ibid., pp. 506-7.

[56] Ibid., pp. 516-17.

[57] Kirmānī, Siyar al-Awliyā', p. 313.

[58] Baranī, Ta'rīkh, pp. 557-58, trans. from M. Habib, Political Theory, pp. 162-63.

[59] S. Nurul Hasan, "Sahīfa-i Na't-i Muhammadī," Medieval India Quarterly, 1, iii & iv (1950): 100.

[60] Agha Mahdi Husain, The Tughlaq Dynasty, rev. and enl. ed. of Rise and Fall of Muhammad bin Tughlaq (Calcutta: Thacker, Spink & Co. Pvt. Ltd., 1963), p. 555.

[61] Baranī, Ta'rīkh, p. 554. Bhatnīr was a fort built by Sher Khān, a noble of Balban's time and was near the fortress of Fīrūzābad, ibid., pp. 65, 566.

[62] Mahdi Husain, Tughlaq Dynasty, p. 553.

[63] Nizami, "Barani," p. 42; Day, "Some Chroniclers," p. 168.

[64] See U. N. Day, "Some Aspects of the Accession of Firuz Shah Tughlaq," Some Aspects of Medieval Indian History, pp. 105-30; Jamini Mohan Banerjee, History of Firuz Shah Tughlaq (Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1967), pp. 12-25; R. C. Jauhari, Firoz Tughlaq (Agra: Shiva Lal Agarwala & Co., 1968), pp. 8-31.

[65] Baranī, Ta'rīkh, p. 546.

[66] Ibid., p. 547.

[67] Ibid., p. 539.

[68] M. Habib, Political Theory, p. 167.

[69] See Jauhari, Firoz Tughlaq, pp. 136-52.

[70] Baranī, Ta'rīkh, p. 165.

[71] Ibid., pp. 338-39.

[72] Ibid., p. 205.

[73] There is nothing to support ʻAbd al-Quddus Hāshmī's contention that this property had been accumulated illegally, Introduction to Shams-i Sirāj ʻAfīf, Ta'rīkh Fīrūz Shāhī, ed. and trans. Muḥammad Fidaʻ ʻAlī (Karachi: Nafīs Academy, 1962), pp. 3-4.

[74] Kirmānī, Siyar al-Awliyā', p. 313.

[75] A. S. Khan, Introduction to Fatāwā, p. 16; Majumdar, Delhi Sultanate, p. 535.

[76] Kirmānī, Siyar al-Awliyā', p. 313.

[77] Baranī, Ta'rīkh, p. 582.

[78] Majumdar, Delhi Sultanate, p. 101.

[79] Kirmānī, Siyar al-Awliyā', p. 313.

80 W. Nassau Lees, "Materials," p. 445. Ironically, Khan-i Jahān is also buried near the grave of Nizām al-Dīn, ʻAfīf, Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī, ed. Maulavi Vilayat Husain, Bibliotheca Indica Series (Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1891), p. 424.

81 ʻAfīf, Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī, p. 177.

82 Agha Mahdi Husain, "Critical Study of the Sources for the History of India," Islamic Culture, 31 (1957): 316.

83 Hardy, Historians, p. 22.

84 Ibid., p. 24.

85 Peter Hardy, "Islam in Medieval India," Sources of Indian Tradition, ed. Wm. Theodore de Bary (New York: Columbia University Press, 1960), p. 446.

86 Baranī, Ta'rīkh, pp. 237-38, 466-67; Baranī, Fatāwā, p. 338.

87 Baranī, Ta'rīkh, p. 602.

88 Ibid., pp. 10-13. This is of necessity a summarisation and paraphrasing of Baranī's arguments. For an English translation, see Hardy, "Islam in Medieval India," pp. 522-24.

89 Baranī, Ta'rīkh, p. 60.

90 Ibid., pp. 200-201.

91 Ibid., p. 166.

92 Ibid., p. 125.

93 Ibid., p. 165.

94 Nizami, "Barani," p. 49.

95 Baranī, Ta'rīkh, pp. 125, 210.

96 Ibid., p. 10.

97 Ibid., p. 23.

[98]Ibid., pp. 123-24. Translated from Mahdi Husain, Tughlaq Dynasty, p. 560.

[99]Ibid., p. 14.

[100]Ibid., p. 346.

[101]See Rizvi, Ādī Turk Kālīn, pp. 106-9.

[102]Baranī, Ta'rīkh, pp. 20-21.

[103]M. Habib, Political Theory, p. 125.

[104]Nizami, "Barani," p. 49.

[105]Kishori Saran Lal, History of the Khaljis, (Allahabad: Asia Publishing House, 1950), p. 356.

[106]Hardy, "Some Studies," p. 111, and "The Oratio Recta of Baranī's Ta'rikh-i Fīrūz Shāhī -- Fact or Fiction?" Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, 20 (1957): 316.

[107]Hardy, Historians, p. 25.

[108]Hardy, "Oratio Recta," pp. 315-21.

[109]Baranī Ta'rīkh, pp. 185-87.

[110]Along with Mahmūd of Ghaznah, other historical personages who appear in the various illustrations also serve as mouthpieces for Baranī.

[111]Aziz Ahmad, "Trends in Political Thought of Medieval Muslim India," Studia Islamica, 17 (1962): 121-22.

[112]For the image of Mahmūd of Ghaznah, see Peter Hardy, "Mahmud of Ghazna and the Historians," Journal of the Punjab University History Society, 14 (1962): 1-36, and C. E. Bosworth, "Mahmud of Ghazna in Contemporary Eyes and in Later Persian Literature," Iran, 4 (1969): 85-92.

[113]Nizami, "Barani," p. 48.

[114]Hardy, "Oratio-Recta," p. 317. Strangely, Habibullah suggests

that it was composed in the early fourteenth century, "Re-evaluation of the Literary Sources of the Pre-Mughal History," Islamic Culture, 15 (1941): 210-11. But in Foundation he says that it was composed in the mid-fourteenth century, p. 12.

115 Khan, Introduction to Fatāwā, pp. 5-6.

116 H. Ethé, Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts in the India Office Library, vol. 1, column, 1377, no. 2563.

117 Khan, Introduction to Fatāwā, p. 35.

118 Baranī, Ta'rīkh, pp. 510-11; Baranī, Fatāwā, p. 200ff.

119 Nassau Lees, "Materials," p. 419 and App.

120 Rizvi, Tughlaq Kālīn, II, App. B.

121 S. B. P. Nigam, "Adminstrative Training of the Nobility under the Sultans of Delhi," Islamic Culture, 41 (1967): 91.

122 Marshall G. Hodgson says that Baranī portrays the 'Turkish and Islamic dignity' of the sultanate, "The Unity of Later Islamic History," Journal of World History, 5 (1960): 890. It is paranoia, more than pride or dignity, that Baranī represents.

123 Khan, Introduction to Fatāwā, p. 57. She also compares it to Machiavelli's Prince and Kautilya's Arthaśastra.

124 Peter Hardy, "Unity and Variety in Indo-Islamic and Perso-Islamic Civilisations: Some Ethical and Political Ideas of Diyā' al-Dīn Baranī, of Delhi, of al-Ghazālī and of Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī compared," Iran, 16 (1978): 127-37.

125 Ibid., p. 127.

126 Peter Hardy, "The Treatment of Violence in Indo-Islamic Persian Writing on History and Polity," Paper presented at the Conference on Islam in South Asia, Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University, Montréal, May 1977.

127 Baranī, Fatāwā, pp. 139-42.

128 Ibid., pp. 126-27.

129 Baranī, _Ta'rīkh_, pp. 27, 34.

130 Ibid., p. 168; Baranī, _Fatāwa_, p. 232.

131 Ibid., p. 127.

132 Baranī, _Ta'rīkh_, p. 44.

133 Ibid., pp. 41-44. See also, Baranī, _Fatāwā_, pp. 12-14.

134 Baranī, _Ta'rīkh_, pp. 32-35.

135 Ibid., pp. 31-32.

136 Ibid., pp. 292ff.

137 Baranī, _Fatāwā_, p. 74.

138 Baranī, _Ta'rīkh_, p. 29.

139 Ibid., p. 49.

140 Baranī, _Fatāwā_, p. 107.

141 Ibid., pp. 50-51.

142 Ibid., p. 54.

143 Ibid., p. 217.

144 Ibid., pp. 219-20.

145 Ibid., pp. 34-35.

146 Ibid., p. 184. He expresses his dissatisfaction with the adminstration of justice under ʿAlā' al-Dīn Khaljī, _Ta'rīkh_, pp. 251-52.

147 Baranī, _Fatāwā_, pp. 66-67.

148 Ibid., p. 131.

[149] Baranī, Ta'rīkh, p. 47.

[150] Baranī, Fatāwā, pp. 118-25.

[151] Baranī, Ta'rīkh, p. 184.

[152] Baranī, Fatāwā, p. 193.

[153] Baranī, Ta'rīkh, p. 510.

[154] Ibid., pp. 521-23.

[155] Ibid., pp. 382-83.

[156] Ibid., p. 253.

[157] Ann K. S. Lambton, Islamic Society in Persia, Inaugural Lecture, School of Oriental and African Studies, London, 9th March 1954, p. 3.

[158] Baranī, Ta'rīkh, pp. 9-10, 17.

[159] Ibid., p. 29.

[160] Ibid., pp. 205-206.

[161] Ibid., pp. 504-506.

[162] Ibid., p. 465.

[163] Ibid., pp. 465-66.

[164] Baranī, Fatāwā, pp. 168-69.

[165] Ibid., p. 16.

[166] Baranī, Ta'rīkh, pp. 436-37. This concern obviously did not extend to the likes of Kotwāl Baranjatan, a Hindu, who had got a wazīfā from Balban but had lost it under Jalāl al-Dīn Khaljī, Ibid., p. 210.

[167] Ibid., pp. 205-206.

[168] Baranī, Fatāwā, p. 180, trans. from Hardy, "Islam in Medieval India," p. 517.

[169] Baranī, Fatāwā, p. 180.

[170] Ibid., p. 137.

[171] Baranī, Ta'rīkh, p. 343.

[172] Baranī, Fatāwā, p. 136.

[173] Baranī, Ta'rīkh, pp. 119-20.

[174] Ibid., pp. 205, 314.

[175] Ibid., p. 182.

[176] Ibid., p. 208.

[177] Ibid., p. 336, Baranī, Fatāwā, pp. 66-67

[178] Kishori Saran Lal, "Ziauddin Barani as as Authority on the Khaljis," Studies in Medieval Indian History (Delhi: Ranjit Printers and Publishers, 1966), p. 107.

[179] Baranī, Ta'rīkh, p. 290, trans. from Habibullah, "Re-evaluation," p. 211.

[180] Baranī, Fatāwā, pp 165-66.

[181] Baranī, Ta'rīkh, p. 59.

[182] Aziz Ahmad, "Trends," p. 125.

[183] Baranī, Fatāwā, pp. 167-68, trans. from Hardy, "Islam in Medieval India," p. 488.

[184] Majumdar, Delhi Sultanate, pp. 24-25.

[185] Ashirbadi Lal Srivastava, The Mughal Empire (Agra: Shiva Lal Agarwala & Co. Ltd., 1964), p. 568.

[186] W. H. Moreland, Agrarian System of Muslim India, 2d ed. (Delhi: Oriental Books Reprint Corporation, 1968), p. 32 , n. 2 or App. C, p. 255.

[187] Habibullah, "Provincial Government," p. 260.

[188] Baranī, Ta'rīkh, p. 572.

[189] He oten confuses Jizyah with Kharāj.

[190] Baranī, Fatāwā, p. 247.

[191] Ibid., p. 11.

[192] Baranī, Ta'rīkh, p. 430.

[193] Ibid., pp. 435-36.

[194] Ibid., p. 586.

[195] M. Habib, Political Theory, p. 126.

[196] Lal, "Barani," p. 101. He also holds that Baranī 'was a frequent visitor to book shops where he could check his references'. Ibid., p. 108.

[197] Khan, Introduction to Fatāwā, p. 44.

[198] Nizami, "Barani," p. 48.

[199] Baranī, Ta'rīkh, p. 9.

[200] Lal, "Barani," p. 101; S. A. Rashid, "Barni," p. 14.

[201] Baranī, Ta'rīkh, pp. 20,25, 39, 127.

[202] Ibid., pp. 32, 61, 119.

[203] Ibid., p. 175.

[204] Ibid., pp. 497, 561.

[205] Ibid., p. 212.

[206] Ibid., p. 205.

[207] Ibid., pp. 55, 65, 110–11, 113, 347.

[208] Ibid., p. 92.

[209] Ibid., pp. 6[illegible], 68, 183.

[210] Ibid., p. 68.

[211] Ibid., p. 114.

[212] Ibid., p. 299.

[213] Ibid., p. 68.

[214] Baranī, Fatāwā, pp. 20, 56, 125.

[215] Ibid., p. 33.

[216] Ibid., p. 56.

[217] Ibid., p. 63.

[218] Ibid., p. 92.

[219] Ibid., p. 99.

[220] Ibid., p. 108.

[221] Ibid., p. 156.

[222] Ibid., p. 174.

[223] Ibid., p. 254.

[224] Ibid., p. 262.

[225] Ibid., p. 278.

[226] Ibid., p. 292.

[227] Ibid., p. 325.

[228] Ibid., p. 333.

[229] See M. Habib, Political Theory, and Persian text of Fatāwā, ed. Khan.

[230] M. Habib, Political Theory, p. 125.

[231] Baranī, Ta'rīkh, p. 13.

[232] Nizami says that he applies the usul-i isnād to history in spite of Baranī's statement to the contrary, "Barani," p. 38.

[233] M. Mujeeb, The Indian Muslims (Montréal: McGill University Press, 1967), p. 176.

[234] Baranī, Ta'rīkh, pp. 90, 91, 92, 93, 589.

[235] Hardy, Historians, p. 39.

[236] Baranī, Fatāwā, pp. 19-20.

[237] Baranī, Ta'rīkh, p. 325.

[238] Ibid., pp. 36-37.

[239] Ibid., pp. 40-41.

[240] Ibid., p. 26.

[241] Ibid., pp. 126-29.

[242] Ibid., p. 170.

[243] Ibid., pp. 283-84, 287, 302-3.

[244] Ibid., pp. 303-4.

[245] Ibid., pp. 283-84.

[246] Ibid., pp. 478-79, 499-504.

[247]Ibid., pp. 25, 127, 175.

[248]Ibid., p. 467, trans. from M. Habib, Political Theory, p. 127.

[249]See Hardy, "Oration Recta."

[250]S. H. Barani, "Barani," p. 96.

[251]Hardy, "Oratio Recta," p. 317.

[252]Majumdar, Delhi Sultanate, pp. 25, 49.

[253]Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, "The Early Turkish Sultans of Delhi," A Comprehensive History of India, vol. 5, eds. M. Habib and Khaliq Ahmad Nizami (New Delhi: Peoples Publishing House, 1970), pp. 280-84.

[254]Lal, Khaljis, p. 358, n. 6.

[255]Lal, "Barani," p. 102. Except for minor changes, the article is identical to his evaluation of Baranī as a source in Khaljis.

[256]Kishori Saran Lal, Muslim State in India, (Allahabad: Vichar Prakashan, 1950), p. 18.

[257]Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, "Sulṭān ʻAlā' al-Dīn ke Madhhabī Rujhanāt," Burhān, 21, v (1948): 201-40; 21, vi (1948): 261-89.

[258]Baranī, Ta'rīkh, p. 187.

[259]U. N. Day, "Market Regulations of Alaud-din Khalji," Some Aspects, pp. 71-88.

[260]Elliot and Dowson, The History of India, vol. 3, p. 95.

[261]Habibullah, "Re-evaluation," p. 209.

[262]Baranī, Ta'rīkh, p. 468.

[263]Ibid., p. 504.

[264]Ibid., p. 75.

[265]Ibid., pp. 150-51.

[266] Baranī, Fatāwā, Advice 22.

[267] Ibid., pp. 107-8.

[268] Baranī, Ta'rīkh, pp. 236-37.

[269] Ibid., pp. 550ff.

[270] M. Habib, Political Theory, p. 137

[271] Baranī, Fatāwā, p. 220.

[272] Ibid., p. 218.

[273] Gavin Hambly, "Who were the Chihilgānī, the Forty Slaves of Sultan Shams al-Dīn Iltutmish of Delhi?" Iran 10 (1972): 57-62.

[274] Baranī, Ta'rīkh, p. 15-16.

[275] Ibid., pp. 365-66.

[276] Ibid., p. 75.

[277] Elliot and Dowson, The History of India, vol. 3, pp. 96-97.

[278] Hardy, Historians, p. 28.

[279] Baranī, Ta'rīkh, pp. 15-16, 206-7.

[280] M. Habib, Political Theory, p. 165.

[281] Baranī, Ta'rīkh, p. 10.

[282] Ibid., pp. 17-18.

[283] Ibid., pp. 48-49.

[284] Ibid., pp. 124-25.

[285] It is ironical and incidental but Fīrūz Shāh. Tughlaq's father Rajab, became some sort of a patron saint for the 'sweeper caste' in India, see, Nassau Lees, "Materials," p. 444.

[286] Baranī, *Ta'rīkh*, p. 166.

[287] Ibid., pp. 365-66.

[288] Ibid., pp. 430, 434-35.

[289] Ibid., pp. 190-91.

[290] Ibid., pp. 193-94.

[291] Ibid., pp. 553-54.

[292] Ibid., p. 554.

[293] See Banerjee, *Firuz Shah Tughlaq*, pp. 133-37, and Jauhari, *Firoz Tughlaq*, pp. 126-28.

[294] Baranī, *Fatāwā*, p. 178.

CHAPTER III

SHAMS-I SIRAJ ʻAFIF[1]

Approximately half a century after Baranī wrote his Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī, ʻAfīf wrote his work, also known as the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī.[2] Ostensibly a continuation of Baranī's work (and hence a continuation of Minhāj's work), the situation in which it was written was very different from those in which Baranī and Minhāj had written. Minhāj had chronicled the establishment of the Turks in northern India. Baranī had had the privilege of describing the consolidation and expansion (as also the beginnings of the decline) of this power. It fell to ʻAfīf to describe the last years of the Delhi sultanate before it was dealt a death-blow by the forces of Tīmūr.

Shams-i Sirāj ʻAfīf came from a family of minor officials who were connected with the Tughlaqs from the time before the family acquired royal power. When Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughlaq was entrusted with Dīpālpūr by ʻAlā' al-Dīn Khaljī, the former had appointed ʻAfīf's great grandfather Malik Saʻad al-Mulk Shihāb ʻAfīf as ʻamaldār (revenue collector) of Abūhar. ʻAfīf also tells us that it was his great grandfather with whom Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughlaq consulted on how to blackmail the Rāi' of Dipālpur into giving his daughter as bride for Ghiyāth al-Dīn's brother Rajab.[3] This lady was to become the mother of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq. ʻAfīf also mentions that his grandfather Shams-i Shihāb ʻAfīf was born on the same day as Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq and that his great grandmother acted as wet nurse to the monarch.[4] We know nothing else about ʻAfīf's

grandfather, but he mentions his father very often. His father seems to have held a number of posts under Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq. At one time he held the post of shab nawīs-i khawāssān,[5] and at another time he was given the responsibility of looking after the canals that Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq had had constructed.[6] He also held posts in the Dīwān-i wizārat,[7] as an adminstrator in the kārkhānahs,[8] and was once entrusted with the distribution of charity when the Sultan visited the grave of saints.[9] He also accompanied Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq on his campaigns to Jājnagar,[10] Nagarkot,[11] and to Thatha.[12] On the last mentioned campaign, the historian's father was entrusted with a flotilla of a thousand boats.[12]

There is a difference of opinion on the possible year of ʻAfīf's birth. Sarkar, without giving us the reference on which basis he had come to this conclusion, places the year of his birth as 1342.[13] This is highly unlikely if we keep in mind that according to ʻAfīf himself, his grandfather was born in the year 1309/10 (i.e., the year of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq's birth). Mahdi Husain thinks he was born in 1350.[14] ʻAfīf mentions that he was twelve years old when the two Aśokan pillars were removed to Fīrūzabād.[15] The date of this transfer is generally assumed to have been 769/1367.[16] This would mean that ʻAfīf was born in 757/1356-57, a few years after the accession of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq.

ʻAfīf vaguely hints at what can be assumed to be details of his own career. Hardy, surprisingly, insists that ʻAfīf does not mention holding any official post himself.[17] Sarkar, following Hardy, also asserts that ʻAfīf was not employed by the state.[18] ʻAfīf, however, on a number of occasions mentions that he used to visit the court with other officials

of the Dīwān-i wizarat.[19] That he must have worked in the Dīwān-i wizārat is attested to by other supplementary indications. He appears particularly familiar with the workings of the Dīwān-i wizārat and goes into great detail about its functionings, as for example, in the muqadimmah on Shams al-Dīn Abūrjā where he mentions being present on the various occasions that he describes.[20] We also know that Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq had adopted the policy of making jobs hereditary,[21] and it is very likely that our author could have succeeded his father in the Dīwān-i wizārat because ʿAfīf mentions having substituted for him in the kārkhānahs.[22] ʿAfīf also mentions that he very often accompanied Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq on his hunting trips.[23]

We know little about ʿAfīf's education or interests apart from the fact that he too, like Minhāj and Baranī, flirted with mysticism. He claims that he was the disciple of Shaykh Quṭb al-Dīn Munawwar of Hansī.[24] That popular mysticism was an important part of his outlook is obvious from the nature of his work. This will be discussed later. At this stage, suffice to say that his interest in mysticism, albeit sincere, was nothing more than superficial.

Ethé has identified the translator of a Sanskrit work on astronomy into Persian as having been ʿAfīf.[25] If this were true, it would place ʿAfīf in a totally different light. But it is extremely unlikely that Ethé is correct. ʿAfīf gives no indication in his Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī that he was equipped with the necessary skills or interests to have undertaken the translation, into Persian, of the Bṛhatsaṃhita of Varāhamira. There are no signs that ʿAfīf knew enough Sanskrit, if any at all, to have translated a technical manual. We also are not made aware by ʿAfīf of any interest on his part in Astronomy/Astrology.

Mentioning the benefits of the Tās Gharyāl installed by Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq, he says that it freed people from depending on ʻilm-i nujūm which was forbidden by the Prophet.[26] Rather than ʻAfīf, it is more likely that the translator of this work was the anonymous author of the Sīrat-i Fīrūz Shāhī.[27]

Only a part of ʻAfīf's work has survived. He mentions having written about Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughlaq[28] and about Muhammad ibn Tughlaq.[29] He also seems to have written about the destruction of Delhi at the hands of Tīmūr's armies.[30] He also intended to write a history of Sultan Muhammad ibn Fīrūz Shāh. At two places he mentions this intention: dar dhikr wa manāqib-i Sultān Muhammad nawrishrah āyad,[31] and inshā Allāh Taʻālā dar muqaddimah-i dhikr-i Sultān Muhammad Fīrūz dhikr-i Ishān nawishtah āyad.[32] Hodivala insists that "the history of the reign of Muhammad ibn Fīrūz was not a mere 'intention' or project as the phrases .... would imply". He points to another reference which he claims "explicitly states that it was completed". The reference he mentions states: In mu'arrikh dar dhikr-i Sultān Muhammad bin Fīrūz nabishtah ast.[33] To insist on the basis of one statement, when two other statements contradict it, that ʻAfīf wrote the history of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq's son before writing the history of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq himself, seems to be wrong. It seems as if Hodivala is taking issue with Elliot and Dowson's translations only for the sake of finding fault with their work. The last statement could be a copyist's error. Moreover, the use in inshā' allāh in the second statement would definitely indicate that ʻAfīf intended to write that history later. This in no way would contradict the assumption that he had written

about the Dhikr-i kharābī-i Dihlī before dealing with the reign of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq because the destruction of Delhi made a deep impression on him.

Mahdi Husain says that he also wrote a history of 'Alā' al-Dīn Khaljī.[34] He does not, however, mention from whence he got this information. Rizvi's conjecture that 'Afīf must have written a history of the events from Sultan Muhammad ibn Sām to Tīmūr[35] is also unsubstantiated. 'Afīf would surely have mentioned such a book as he does his other works.

Regarding the name by which 'Afīf's work is known to us today Hardy feels that:

> only use and convenience (to which the book adheres) have attached the title Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī to this work. 'Afīf who himself did not refer to it by this name, appeared to have regarded it as a part of a larger historical composition .... (36)

This assertion, based on the fact that 'Afīf did not refer to it by this specific title, is not valid. 'Afīf in his introduction to the work pointedly tells us that it is a continuation of Baranī's Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī. He also refers to his own work as a Ta'rīkh: dar īn Ta'rīkh darj kardan.[37] Therefore it is not simply sheer convenience to refer to 'Afīf's work as Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī. That in 'Afīf's perception there was little difference between Ta'rīkh and manāqib is a different matter and will be dealt with later.

It would also be wrong to assume that 'Afīf's work was a part of a larger composition.[38] It may have been part of one 'larger historical composition' in the sense of a series of histories of successive rulers. But the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī is complete in itself (as the table of contents of the complete version indicates) and

stands by itself.

The *Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī* was definitely written after the invasion of Tīmūr in 1398-99. Mahdi Husain on the basis of internal evidence places its composition in the first decade of the fifteenth century.[39] No complete copy of the work is available today. The Bibliotheca Indica edition, according to Hardy, is "nearest to being complete".[40] It is divided into five *qisms* each of which consists of eighteen *muqaddimahs*. The division of this history into ninety *muqaddimahs* has a rather simple reason behind it. 'Afīf tells us that Baranī wanted to write a hundred and one *muqaddimahs* about Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq and that he could complete only eleven. 'Afīf therefore undertook to write the other ninety.[41] The Bibliotheca Indica edition ends in the middle of the fifteenth *muqaddimah* of the last *qism*.[42]

In the introduction to the *Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī* 'Afīf speaks in general terms of praise for God and his Prophet. Unlike Baranī he does not even pay lip-service to the universalist traditions of Islamic history writing. He includes in his introduction a discussion, couched in *ṣūfī* terminology, about the ten *maqāmāt* applicable to kings.[43] The first *qism* deals with the birth and childhood of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq, his training under Muḥammad ibn Tughlaq, the death of Muḥammad ibn Tughlaq and the choosing of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq to succeed him, Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq's reluctance in accepting the throne, the establishment of a child on the throne of Delhi by Khwājah-i Jahān Aḥmad 'Ayāz, and Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq's eventual occupation of the throne of Delhi. The second *qism* deals with Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq's expeditions to Lakhnawtī, Jājnagar, Nāgarkot and the establishment of Ḥiṣār Fīrūzah. The

third deals with Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq's disastrous campaigns to Thatha, the setting up of the astronomical clock and gong. The fourth qism goes on to detail the activities of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq after he had decided to refrain from waging any more wars, his building activities, his collection of slaves, accounts of the gardens that the king had planted, his charities, descriptions of his coinage and of the various festivities at the court. In the last qism ʻAfīf deals with matters of religious import like the abolition on non-sharʻī taxes, the burning of a brahman, the imposition of jizyah, the various 'wonders' and 'oddities' of the reign of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq and accounts of some major nobles. That ʻAfīf prefaced his work with a list of contents detailing what he would deal with in which muqaddimah implies that he, unlike Baranī, had planned his work before he set down to writing it. After all, he had to fit all that he had to say into ninety muqaddimahs. But the assertion that the division by ʻAfīf is indicative of a "studied interpretation",[44] cannot be accepted in totality. Mukhia when he makes this observation may be correct in as much as these "qisms appear to be the phases in which the historian studies Firuz Shah's reign" but to imply, as Mukhia does, that ʻAfīf's work was basically an attempt to find the causes for the "decline of his contemporary state"[45] (and therefore by implication Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq's responsibility for it) is too far-fetched. Essentially Mukhia confuses what modern historians make out of ʻAfīf's data with ʻAfīf's intentions.

ʻAfīf's motives for writing his history are not very clear, since we do not have all his other histories. On the basis of the one that is available to us, we can make only generalised assumptions. It

is obvious that 'Afīf was not a 'court historian' even in the sense that he was writing to please someone important. There was nothing to be gained in terms of material rewards for his writing a flattering account of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq. Why then did he write a history which is so singularly lacking in any criticism of a reign in which there was so much to be critical about? It is obvious that the one event which made the most lasting impression on our author's mind was the invasion of Tīmūr.[46] He constantly refers to this event apart from having written an account of it separately. He could therefore have been motivated to write a history of the Delhi sultanate to "dwell nostalgically upon Delhi's golden past" as Hardy says. Hardy continues by saying that 'Afīf wrote because he considered it his "duty to record the great deeds for the edification of his readers".[47] Hardy takes into account that 'Afīf might have written to recreate an era for both himself and his readers, an era which seemed wonderful compared with the conditions of Delhi after its sack at the hands of Tīmūr's forces, but indicates a preference for his latter assumption. This is in keeping with Hardy's general treatment of medieval Muslim historiography of India. For him, the 'edification' aspect is of great importance because of its religious overtones. He says that the work of medieval Muslim historians can make sense only when studied in a religious framework:

> The ultimate status and meaning of the statements which the historians of the Delhi sultanate make about the words and deeds, the ideas and beliefs of the historical personages who figure in their histories should then be established within a religious, indeed an Islamic, frame of reference in which transcendental values and Divine providence are to be seen infusing and suffusing temporal life, to the

> purposes not of temporal life in and for itself, but to the purposes, infinite and inpenetrable, of God. To seek a purely historical truth .... is to kill the living experience of the past at the very moment of, and in the very endeavour of, trying to understand it. (48)

Mukhia, reacting to this a priori assumption of Hardy, holds a view at the other extreme. He suggests that 'Afīf, almost like a modern historian, had set himself the task of analysing the causes for the decline of the state.[49] Both these views have to be examined in greater detail in order to understand the real nature of 'Afīf's Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī.

Hardy classifies the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī as belonging to the manāqib or faḍā'il type of history written in India.[50] Since 'Afīf constantly uses the term manāqib in reference to his works and because the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī is eulogistic in tone, one can agree with him on this point. The Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī abounds in ṣūfī undertones as Hardy has pointed out in his essay on 'Afīf.[51] 'Afīf begins his work with a description of various maqāmāt for sultans and insists on treating Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq as if he were a ṣūfī. The imagery and concepts used in his history are often derived from the more popular aspects of mysticism. For example, Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq's assumption of the throne is treated as if he were a ṣūfī disciple succeeding his master as the head of the order.[52] Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq instinctively refuses the throne because of his inherent humility but eventually places the good of others above his own inclinations. But was 'Afīf's decision to use the 'literary genre' of the manāqib style literature where the "good qualities of the subject of the memoir must be displayed to advantage" dictated by the fact that he was dealing with a monarch

who was "a crowned saint presiding over the fortunes of the Delhi sultanate".[53] Hardy, even though he admits that ʻAfīf was not trying to show the "sultan triumphantly overcoming all the successive vicissitudes of his reign"[54] does assume a link between the subject, i.e., Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq and the form, i.e., the manāqib genre of the work. For Hardy, ʻAfīf was trying to depict Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq "as engaged in healing the conflict which he, the sultan, and ex hypothesis ʻAfīf, knew to have riven the relations between Muḥammad bin Tughlaq and the religious classes to the detriment both of the Delhi sultanate and of Islam".[55] In describing the nature of manāqib style literature Hardy tells us the ʻAfīf treats Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq's reign as the "spectacle of an ideal man witnessing to his ideal character .... History is what must have happened when an ideal ruler presided over the Delhi sultanate".[56]

There are some assumptions here which have to be dispelled in order to avoid confusion. Fīrūz Shāh Tughalq is the ideal ruler, hence the subject of a manāqib. Fīruz Shah Tughlaq is the 'scourge of unorthodoxy' and 'defender of the faith',[57] healing the divisions which have arisen in the social fabric of his time due to the ill-advised policies of Muḥammad ibn Tughlaq. On its face, this view can be accepted as valid. But then, did not ʻAfīf write a manāqib for Muḥammad ibn Tughlaq also, the sultan whose mistakes Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq was now undoing? To crown this, ʻAfīf intended to write a manāqib for Muḥammad ibn Fīrūz Shāh, a ruler whose short reign must have been extremely difficult to portray as an ideal reign.

Hardy's classification of the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhi as a

manaqīb style writing therefore should not lead us to presume that there was a connection between Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq and the genre chosen to treat his reign. It can safely be stated that for ʻAfīf, Ta'rīkh and manāqib were interchangeable. It is doubtful if he was conscious of the difference between the two. The reasons why the manāqib form most probably suggested itself to ʻAfīf are not difficult to pinpoint. Firstly, writing in the period following the destruction of the sultanate of Delhi it was only natural for ʻAfīf to be nostalgic about the events prior to the invasion of Tīmūr. The last century of the Delhi sultanate was treated as its swan song, a period of peace and prosperity and one where all conflict was absent. The mystifying terminology of mysticism was the medium ideally suited for this purpose. Secondly, the choice of treating history in ṣūfī terminology could be the result of, and also indicative of, the popularisation of ṣūfī concepts and terminology among the literate people of the sultanate. M. Habib, in his discussion of the mystic records of the Delhi sultanate has shown that a number of mystical records were fabricated in the fourteenth century.[58] The reasons for these fabrications he finds in the great demands for works relating to popular mysticism. Muḥammad ibn Tughlaq's conflict with the ṣūfīs had had a two-fold effect. It had dispersed the genuine disciples of Niẓām al-Dīn Awliyā' from the capital, leading to a void which these fabricated works tried to fill.[59] Secondly, mysticism was no longer a parallel strain in the religious consciousness of the Muslims of Delhi. Mysticism had "bowed to the Sultan".[60] Therefore there would be no contradiction in ʻAfīf's aim in portraying Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq as a ruler trying to enforce orthodoxy who was also

a ṣūfī.[61] In fact, it would have appeared legitimate to do so.

Hardy's exhortation to study these historians in a larger Islamic frame of reference would be like looking at them through the wrong end of a telescope. There can be no doubt about the historians, and in this instance ʿAfīf's religious concerns and outlooks. One must also acknowledge that their religious perceptions were very strong and that they phrased their reactions in religious terminology. But one would have to ask if these religious perceptions were universally common to Muslims or if they were conditioned by the socio-political developments of the milieu in which the historians were operating. The pre-dominant religious element in ʿAfīf's writng should not lead us into believing that for him 'Divine providence' was "infusing and suffusing temporal life, to the purposes not of temporal life in and for itself, but to the purposes, infinite and inpenetrable, of God". If this is what Hardy perceives the attitude to be, then it is because material realities and historical conditions had produced this outlook.

Mukhia, differing with Hard's view-point, wants to see ʿAfīf as trying to find the reasons for the decay of the temporal world in history. According to Mukhia, ʿAfīf is trying to study the history of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq to find the reasons for the collapse of the sultanate of Dehli. His suggestion that the praise ʿAfīf lavishes on Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq should not be taken at its face value is surprising because he doesnot adopt such an attitude towards Baranī. As has been pointed out in the last chapter, Baranī had actually asked his readers to read between the lines of his Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī. ʿAfīf makes no such demands and does not seem to be conscious of there being a

methodology to history writing in the way Baranī was. ʻAfīf lacks the critical attitude: he could not be critical and yet plan to write a <u>manāqib</u> of Muḥammad ibn Fīrūz Shāh. Mukhia points to the grim picture of the conditions of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq's reign that emerges from ʻAfīf's account to prove his point. ʻAfīf does describe the absence of any major armed victory of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq even though the ruler mounted expeditions against Lakhnawtī, Jājnagar and Nagarkot;[62] the catastrophes that befell the royal armies while withdrawing from Jājnagar[63] and Thatha,[64] the gross inefficiency and the corruption in the army,[65] the corruption in the <u>Dīwān-i wizārāt</u>,[66] and the large scale alienation of revenue to various officers, military commanders and holy men.[67] Thus, we do get a highly uncomplimentary picture of the state of affairs during Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq's reign from reading ʻAfīf's account. But can one impose the deductions of modern historians based on ʻAfīf's work on ʻAfīf himself? Can we assume that ʻAfīf's work was a critique of the reign of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq's reign? ʻAfīf, unlike Baranī, does not provide us with his conception of the duties of a historian. The comparisons and examples which he draws from the reigns of other rulers also do not support such a view. ʻAlā' al-Dīn, he informs us, did not assign revenues the way Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq did.[68] But he points out that the prices were much lower in the reign of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq, and that there were no famines in his reign.[69] Mentioning Jalāl al-Dīn Khaljī's reign, he praises the wisdom of a <u>wazīr</u> who created a new post, where none had existed, to accomodate a royal favourite,[70] an example which would seem to provide historical justification for similar forms of corruption under Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq. Therefore, even if ʻAfīf

provides us with enough material to write a critique of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq's reign, there are no indications that 'Afīf himself meant to be critical.

One then has to face the question regarding the real nature of the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī. 'Afīf's concerns reflect in and define the nature of his work. The image he paints of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq's reign reflects the times and conditions in which he was writing, e.g., a Delhi laid desolate by the armies of a foreign invader. He sees the late monarch's reign as one of peace, prosperity and tranquility. With the central political authority of Delhi broken and with it no longer being the center of political and social power, he looks back through the mystifying screen of nostalgia and longing. Therefore his emphasis on the peaceful aspects of the reign of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq. Sub-consciously, rather than deliberately, he depicts the reign of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq as an age completely free of conflict.

'Afīf's constant reference to the prosperous economic conditions under Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq tells us more about the Delhi of the time when he was writing than about the times he was attempting to describe. By picking on the more positive aspects of the late sultan's reign and by twisting the negative aspects until they began looking positive, he was betraying his outlook. But this was no deliberate and dishonest misrepresentation. History is a reaction between the historian and his facts. 'Afīf therefore mentions those facts and gives that colouring to his history which makes sense to him. He therefore on a number of occasions tells us how cheap things were in the reign of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq. As far as 'Afīf was concerned, what could be more indicative

of the peace of mind of the people than that parents could marry off their daughters at a young age?[71] For those who were poor, the state provided charity so that they could get their daughters married.[72] Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq cared for the aged.[73] And ʿAfīf cites a testimonial from Shaykh Bahā al-Dīn Dakariyā to the effect that people's material concerns were looked after. The Shaykh al-Islām is supposed to have congratulated Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq for freeing him from worldly worries so that he was free to concentrate all his attention on the hereafter.[74] Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq is supposed to have set up a campaign to locate and employ all the unemployed of the capital.[76] Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq took personal interest in seeing that justice was never miscarried,[77] and the ruler did not make anyone unhappy.[78] The nobility was happy and had amassed wealth.[79] Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq's role in this corruption by which most of these fortunes were collected is interpreted as the monarch's concern for the welfare of his subjects.[80]

In the religious sphere too, things were extremely rosy in ʿAfīf's account. Fīrūz Shāh is compared with the Prophet in his hesitançy to accept the throne.[81] Having made this comparison, ʿAfīf could find the conditions nothing but ideal under the Sultan who is styled as the khatm-i tājdārān-i Dār al-Mulk-i Dihlī.[82] Every thing was according to the sharīʿah. This claim seems ironic in the light of, but might also have been prompted by, Tīmūr's excuse for invading Delhi, e.g. that the Muslim rulers of India had been corrupted away from the ideals of Islam by Hinduism.[83] ʿAfīf assures us that, like a good Muslim king, Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq abolished non-sharʿī practices and taxes, enforced the sharīʿah and consulted with religious and holy men regarding state

policies.[84] He also reimposed the jizyah, a duty that earlier Muslim kings had neglected,[85] and made a Brahman pay for his life for having led a Muslim woman into apostacy.[86] And because Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq was a true Muslim king, God rewarded him in the form of recognition by the Caliph.[87]

As far as ʻAfīf is concerned, there is a singular lack of any conflict or tension under Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq. ʻAfīf, having witnessed the conflict in the last years of the reign of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq's reign and the havoc caused by Tīmūr's invasion, it is understandable that the conflicts and tensions of the reign of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq paled in comparison and did not linger on in his mind. In his view Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq was successful which ever way he turned without even having to use arms, and the weapons of war became obsolete.[88] The ruler's campaigns are not treated as if the monarch were facing the centrifugal tendencies that had begun to appear in the empire. Fīrūz Shāh is considered successful in his Jājnagar campaign because he returned with seventy-three elephants.[89] Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq's reasons for marching towards Thatha are taken to have been the Sultan's praiseworthy desire to fulfil the unfulfilled desires of the late sultan Muḥammad ibn Tughlaq.[90] ʻAfīf would also want us to believe that there was just one rebellion in the reign of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq, that or Shams al-Dīn Dāmghānī, and it was easily quelled when the rebel was murdered.[91] The relations between the king and the nobility and of the nobility among themselves were also peaceful. Only one muqtaʻ was killed during the reign.[92] ʻAfīf also disagrees with Baranī's version of the Khwājah-i Jahān's actions were in no way a defiance of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq. Instead

we are told that the Khwājah-i Jahān acted in the way he did because he was misinformed .[93] When he had to deal with the execution of the Khwājh-i Jahān, ʻAfīf again presented the event in a way to make it appear that in the very beginning of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq's reign there was no open defiance of the ruler's authority. Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq we are told, had forgiven the former wazīr, but the other nobles decided that he had to be punished. Khwājah-i Jahān's execution is then presented as if he himself asked to be killed as a pious act of atonement for his sin of trying to rise above the station of a wazīr.[94]

Similarily, the only way muqtāʻs were pressurised into paying their dues was to humiliate them by removing their turbans.[95] Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq also did not want the deserters from his army to be punished too severely.[96] When ʻAfīf did describe conflicts, they always ended very reasonably. He described the conflict between ʻAyn al-Mulk and the Khān-i Jahān in great detail, but the conflict ended with ʻAyn al-Mulk saying that he would not do anything to harm the state.[97] ʻImād al-Mulk who had collected a great fortune illegally gave it up voluntarily to Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq.[98] The difference between the ʻulamā' and the mashāyikh is reduced to a difference over the time of prayers which Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq solved easily with the installation of the astronomical clock and the gong.[99] ʻAfīf would also have us believe that Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq was tolerant of all religions and sects because "Tolerance has been regarded as the greatest virtue in all religions but specially so in Islam."[100]

ʻAfīf might have couched his Ta'rīkh in the terminology of manāqib literature, but history for him was popular literature. Minhāj

was dull and dry, interested only in cataloguing the events he could put together. Baranī was a self-opinionated theoriser. For Baranī, history was the vehicle to proclaim his views on politics and religion. ʻAfīf is different from both. He wrote with a wider though more unsophisticated audience in mind, in simple clear terms with no intellectual pretensions. He retails his history as if it were a children's story, simple and uncomplicated. He tells it in straightforward language and tries to make it interesting. He gives details of trivialities which would be distracting and amusing for his readers. He talks about giants and midgets, of bearded women, and of a cow with the hooves of a horse, of a three-legged sheep and a cow with a red beak.[101] He attempted not to tax the patience of his readers and apologised for repeating a story that he had mentioned in his account of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughlaq.[102] And he tells his story in sūfī terminology which was to give it some extra distinction. As argued earlier, the popularity of sūfī literature would indicate that this terminology was not only understandable to his readers but also popular. Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq is referred to as hadrat, and he is supposed to have ruled for the symbolic forty years.[103] The love between Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq and the Nā'ib Bārbak is referred to as the love between a pīr and his murīd.[104] Portents and omens predicted the accession of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq.[105] A note of the mysterious is added when ʻAfīf tells us that the engravings on the Aśokan pillars which no one had been able to decipher were actual predictions that Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq would be the king who would finally be able to move these pillars.[106] A physical description of the monarch is included, and ʻAfīf tells us

how stout-hearted Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq was, how the king maintained his calm when informed that an important prisoner was escaping.[107] Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq's sagacity is indicated by the ruler's continuing to hunt when informed that the governor of Sindh had come to negotiate surrender.[108] Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq's military campaigns, when they are described, are not burdened by dull military detail but include descriptions of how the king took time off to hunt elephants.[109] Barring the muqadimmahs on the nobles, the muqadimmahs on the removal of the Aśokan pillars and on how the royal hunt was organised are among the longest. 'Afīf also attempts to restore the morale and self-confidence of his readers. Even Tīmūr, he tells us, was impressed by Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq's achievement in transfering the pillars.[110] History was a fairy tale, occasionally marred by unpleasant happenings such as wars, etc., which are then presented in as pleasant a way as possible. The miseries of the Sindh campaign are described starkly, but when 'Afīf describes the celebrations that followed the return of the army, they stand out in higher relief. Unpleasant details are camouflaged. Towards the end of his account, eager to tell the entire story but not to ruin the generally pleasant tone of his history, 'Afīf gives a succession of dates, highlighting the main events, all of which would have spoilt the story. The death of important nobles, the illness of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq, the open conflict between Prince Muhammad Khān and Khān-i Jahān and the death of the monarch are mentioned quickly.[111]

History was a love affair between Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq and the population who pined for the Sultan when he was absent, even if it was for only a few days,[112] and a separate muqadimmah is allotted to the

celebrations that followed the return of the ruler from his campaigns. This same Sultan decided to give up waging war because it was not befitting a good Muslim king to do so since it emptied the treasury which could otherwise be utilised for the benefit of the Muslims and because war endangers the honour of good Muslim women.[113] Politics and circumstances are simplified to suit the lowest common denominator of his reader's interests and their expectations of what the glorious past had been.

'Afīf, unlike Baranī, is no political theorist. His aim, most likely, in writing the Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī was to provide his readers with an image of the past which was glorious, comfortable and peaceful, a definite diversion from the situation of the first decade of the fifteenth century when he was writing. The political thought that emerges from his work is simplistic and common. He accepts the view that a monarch is essential to society.[114] God inspires the hearts of kings.[115] The king is responsible for the good of his subjects and will be answerable before God for it. The power structure, as 'Afīf explains it, is simplified in the most commonly understood terms. On more than one occasion he describes in detail who sat where and who could speak to whom on formal occasions.[116] The lessons that history teaches are simple and undemanding too. He stresses that he is describing the organisation and efficiency of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq's hunting expeditions so that the wise can learn lessons from them.[117]

There is also a major difference in the attitude of 'Afīf and that of Minhāj and Baranī towards the Hindus. The Hindus, in 'Afīf's perception occupy a different position from that described by the

other two historians. They were no longer the major threat. The ruler whom ʻAfīf eulogises spent more time fighting fellow Muslims (for example in Bengal and Sindh) than he did non-Muslims. The rulers that Minhāj dealt with had to face major resistance from indigenous rulers. Unlike Baranī, ʻAfīf had witnessed the destruction of his world at the hands of another Muslim ruler, not the Hindus and ʻAfīf knew that both Hindus and Muslims suffered at the hands of the 'Mongols'.[118] The dhimmīs too, according to ʻAfīf, were content under Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq.[119] That Hindus participated in the religious festivals at the court did not bother him.[120] Neither did the Hindu customs which had been assimilated into Muslim social behaviour. He describes, not with anger or irritation, but with approval, that Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq used to touch the Shaykh al-Islām's feet.[121]

He does compliment Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq for burning a Brahman[122] and for levying the jizyah on the Brahmans.[123] This is in keeping with his tendency to glorify everything that Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq did. What is striking in the case of ʻAfīf is that the self-confidence of the Muslim intellectual, so obvious in the case of Minhāj who was disdainful of even noticing the social, intellectual or religious life of the Hindus, is absent. It is also different from Baranī's attitude which was one of frustration, where a Muslim intellectual made the Hindus the scapegoat for his own frustrations in not having succeeded in spite of having been a 'high-born' Muslim. ʻAfīf no longer exhibits the self-confidence to be able able to ignore or abuse Hindus. In fact there are traces of self-apologia in ʻAfīf's attitude.

He describes in detail the prosperity of Jājnagar, mentioning abundance of animals, fruits, grain and wealth. But he also noticed that

there were no Muslims there. Faced with this contradiction which Minhāj would not even have noticed and which Baranī might have ignored, ʻAfīf took refuge in apology cast in religious allusions. He tells us that the Prophet has rightly mentioned that the world is in any case a blessing for the non-believers, for untold miseries await them in the hereafter. For Muslims on the other hand, deprivation in this world is irrelevant, for untold rewards await them in the next.[124] In another instance, talking of the two Aśokan pillars, he is confronted by and mentions a popular myth. These two pillars, the local folklore held, were the sticks of the Hindu God Bhīm, who was a giant, and who used them for grazing animals whose size matched the size of the humans who inhabited this area at that time. ʻAfīf does not deride or sneer at this display of 'ignorance'. This tolerance for the story might represent the diminishing feeling of superiority of his generation of Muslim over the Hindus. Instead he creates an argument which smells of apology. The Prophet, according to ʻAfīf, was told by God that he was creating the Prophet's followers to be small so that they would not need much to live by.[125]

Causation for ʻAfīf is divinely ordained. Fīrūz Shāh succeeded because of the grace of God.[126] The armies of Tīmūr had laid waste to Delhi within a decade of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq's death. Hence it is not surprising that for ʻAfīf it was the death of this 'great' sultan which brought on that calamity.[127] But ʻAfīf cannot help mentioning his suspicions that there might be other reasons for the decline of the sultanate of Delhi, such as the enmity between the Khān-i Jahān and Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq's son,[128] or that the last sultan's obsession with

collecting slaves and entrusting them with positions of power, lead to destructive factionalism after his death.[129] But these sorts of perceptions are visible only in reference to the conditions of the post-Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq period. Describing the reign, all that ʻAfīf is concerned with is that things were better than the time he was writing; and therefore, the period was some sort of a golden age. He is not interested in why certain things were the way they were. The most obvious explanation and the one that is easiest for him to accept, is that things were as they were because of 'Divine pleasure' or the blessings of some saint.[130]

ʻAfīf's sources for his history are largely hearsay or what he himself had been witness to. A good and trustrworthy person's word was good enough for him. But it is wrong to say that "Afīf "did not argue from his evidence to decide upon disputed points".[131] ʻAfīf does make it a point of refuting the account of Khwājah-i Jahān's behaviour given by Baranī. Baranī says that the nobles' action after the death of Muḥammad ibn Tughlaq were motivated by ambition. ʻAfīf tells us that the version he heard from one Kishwar Khān bin Kishlū Khān was that the Khwājah-i Jahān acted out of ignorance and not bad faith, and that this was the true account.[132] He does mention written sources such as the Qābūs Nāmah of 'Qābūs Hakīm',[133] the Khayr al-Majālis of Shaykh Nasīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd[134] and Baranī.[135] But he largely relies on what he had heard from 'trustworthy informers',[136] his father,[137] and even his grandmother.[138] He himself was a witness to many of the things that he mentions.[139]

ʻAfīf's Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī does [illegible] have the serious veneer

of Minhāj's work nor the intellectual pretensions of Baranī. His concerns are broader too. He mentions details which are not connected with political intrigue or court factionalism. He describes in detail the architectural activities of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq, his building of canals and planting of gardens, the working of the royal mint, details of army camps, the prices of food, details of coinage, celeberation of festivals, revenue arrangements, among other things. He throws more light on the social history of the period than do Minhāj and Baranī. Its concerns reflects the concerns of people outside the court circles. Through his work we get, for the first time, the problems of the common people being reflected, even to a very small degree, in the works of a medieval chronicler. This might have been so because the class to which 'Afīf belonged was now made aware of things outside of the functioning of the government and adminstration because it had lost most of its own power. 'Afīf's work is an attempt to tell a simple, straightforward story of the reign of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq. Its strength lies in this simplicity and straightforwardness.

'Afīf might not have meant to do so, but his work is the document that most graphically illustrates the decline of the sultanate of Delhi. What he had meant as praises, today provide us with insights into what had gone wrong with the political and administrative framework of the government. His praises for Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq might have been sincere, his longing for a bygone age genuine, and his terminology and logic, the only one he knew. But the value of his work as a source, like that of any other work, has to be judged on the basis of how much it helps us to learn about the period that it covers. 'Afīf might have been an uncritical historian. He might have "aimed to preserve the impression,

in the the manāqib idiom of a golden age for the Delhi sultanate,"[140] but he is the source for this crucial period that best illustrates the decay that had set into the body-politic of the sultanate of Delhi. And in this lies its basic strength.

NOTES

[1]Actually Shams al-Dīn ibn Sirāj 'Afīf. 'Afīf seems to have been a family name because it was appended to the names of both his great-grandfather and grandfather.

[2]Shams-i Sirāj, Ta'rīkh Fīrūz Shāhī, ed. Maulvi Vilayat Husain, Bibliotheca Indica Series (Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1890). There are the following translations of the work also available: Henry M. Elliot and John Dowson, The History of India as Told by its Own Historians, vol. 3 (London: Trubner & Co., 1871), pp. 269-373; Muhammad Fidā 'Alī Talib, in Urdu (Karachi: Nafīs Academy, 1962); Saiyid Athar Abbas Rizvi, Tughlaq Kālīn Bhārat, II (Aligarh: Department of History, Aligarh Muslim University, 1959), pp. 51-194. All references are from the Bibliotheca Indica edition (hereafter, 'Afīf, Ta'rīkh).

[3]'Afīf, Ta'rīkh, p. 37.

[4]Ibid., p. 39.

[5]Ibid., p. 127.

[6]Ibid., pp. 130-31.

[7]Ibid., p. 197.

[8]Ibid., p. 339.

[9]Ibid., p. 196.

[10]Ibid., p. 163.

[11]Ibid., p. 186.

[12]Ibid., p. 199.

[13]Jagadish Narayan Sarkar, "Historical Biography in Persian in Medieval India," Indo-Iranica, 29, i-iv (1976): 44; and "Personal History of Some Medieval Historians and their Writings," Historians of Medieval India, ed. Mohibbul Hasan, with a Foreward by Muhammad Mujeeb (Meerut: Meenakshi Prakashan, 1968), p. 173.

[14]Agha Mahdi Husain, The Tughlaq Dynasty, rev. and enl. ed. of Rise and Fall of Muhammad bin Tughlaq (Calcutta: Thacker, Spink & Co. Pvt. Ltd.,

1963), p. 578; and "Critical Study of the Sources for the History of India," Islamic Culture, 31 (1957): 318.

15 ʿAfīf, Ta'rīkh, p. 310.

16 Mahdī Husain, Tughlaq Dynasty, p. 411; Peter Hardy, Historians of Medieval India: Studies in Indo-Muslim Historial Writing (London: Luzac & Co., 1960), p. 40; Banarsi Prasad Saksena, "Firuz Shah Tughlaq," A Comprehensive History of India (New Delhi: Peoples Publishing House, 1970), p. 607; R. C. Jauhari, Firoz Tughlaq (Agra: Shiva Lal Agarwala & Co., 1968), p. 175.

17 Hardy, Historians, p. 41.

18 J. N. Sarkar, "Personal History," p. 173; Hardy, Historians, p. 41.

19 ʿAfīf, Ta'rīkh, pp. 105, 281, 285.

20 Ibid., pp. 451-92.

21 Ibid., pp. 96, 302-5.

22 Ibid., p. 339.

23 Ibid., pp. 319, 321-22.

24 Ibid., p. 131. Hardy refers to him as Qutb al-Din Manwar, Historians, p. 47. Quṭb al-Dīn Munawwar was a disciple of Niẓām al-Dīn Awliyā', see Saiyid Athar Abbas Rizvi, History of Sufism, vol. 1 (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd., 1978), pp. 178-79.

25 H. Ethé, Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the India Office Library, vol. 1, column 1111-1112, no. 1997.

26 ʿAfīf, Ta'rīkh, pp. 256-57.

27 S. H. Hodivala, Studies in Indo-Muslim History, vol. 2 (Bombay: R. S. Hodivālā, 1957), pp. 130-31.

28 ʿAfīf, Ta'rīkh, p. 36.

29 Ibid., pp. 42, 51.

[30]Ibid., p. 185.

[31]Ibid., pp. 148-49.

[32]Ibid., p. 273.

[33]Ibid., p. 428; Hodivala, Studies, vol. 2, p. 117.

[34]Mahdi Husain, Tughlaq Dynasty, p. 578. However, he does not include the history of Muḥammad ibn Fīrūz Shāh in the list of ʻAfīf's works.

[35]Rizvi, Tughlaq Kālīn, II, p. [illegible].

[36]Hardy, Historians, p. 40.

[37]ʻAfīf, Ta'rīkh, pp. 29-30.

[38]Hardy, Historians, p. 40. U. N. Day, "Some Chronicles and Chroniclers of Medieval India," Some Aspects of Medieval Indian History (New Delhi: Kumar Brothers, 1971), p. 173.

[39]Mahdi Husain, Tughlaq Dynasty, p. 578.

[40]Hardy, Historians, p. 40.

[41]ʻAfīf, Ta'rīkh, p. 30.

[42]As an indication of the liberties often taken in translations, Ṭālib, in his translation of ʻAfīf's work adds "and Fīrūz Shāh died" at the point where the Bibliotheca Series breaks off, Ṭālib, p. 232.

[43]For a translation and summary of the various maqāqmāt, see Hardy, Historians, p. 42.

[44]Harbans Mukhia, Historians and Historiography during the Reign of Akbar (New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., 1976), p. 6.

[45]Ibid., p. 29.

[46]ʻAfīf, Ta'rīkh, pp. 21-22, 76, 82, 133, 185, 292-93, 314, 427-28.

47 Hardy, *Historians*, p. 41.

48 Peter Hardy, "The Muslim Historians of the Delhi Sultanate: Is What they Say really What they Mean?" *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Pakistan*, 9, i (1964): 63.

49 Mukhia, *Historians and Historiography*, pp. 26-29.

50 Hardy, "Some Studies," pp. 120-21.

51 Hardy, *Historians*, pp. 40-55.

52 ʿAfīf, *Ta'rīkh*, pp. 45-46.

53 Hardy, *Historians*, p. 50.

54 Ibid., p. 49.

55 Hardy, "The Muslim Historians," pp. 59-60.

56 Peter Hardy, "Some Studies in Pre-Mughal Historiography," *Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon*, ed. C. H. Philips (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), p. 121.

57 Hardy, *Historians*, p. 48.

58 Mohammad Habib, "Chisti Mystic Records of the Sultanate Period," *Politics and Society During the Early Medieval Period*, ed. Khaliq Ahmad Nizami (New Delhi: Peoples Publishing House, 1974), pp. 385-443.

59 Ibid., p. 430.

60 Aziz Ahmad, "Sufi and Sultan in Pre-Mughal Muslim India," *Der Islam*, 38 (1962): 153.

61 According to ʿAfīf, Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq had qualities only found in Awliyā, *Ta'rīkh*, p. 513.

62 Ibid., pp. 109-20, 144-72, 186-89, 230-47.

63 Ibid., pp. 172-73.

[64] Ibid., pp. 207-8.

[65] Ibid., pp. 298-304.

[66] Ibid., pp. 341-42.

[67] Ibid., pp. 94-95.

[68] Ibid., p. 95.

[69] Ibid., pp. 293-94.

[70] Ibid., p. 420.

[71] Ibid., pp. 180-81, 296.

[72] Ibid., pp. 349-51.

[73] Ibid., pp. 302-3.

[74] Ibid., pp. 96-97.

[75] Ibid., pp. 96-98, 179-81, 316, 349-66, 537-61.

[76] Ibid., pp. 334-35.

[77] Ibid., pp. 503-8.

[78] Ibid., p. 253.

[79] Ibid., pp. 297,439.

[80] Ibid., pp. 298-301.

[81] Ibid., pp. 276-77.

[82] Ibid., p. 21.

[83] Kunwar Mohammad Ashraf, Life and Conditions of the People of Hindustan, 2d. ed. (New Delhi: Munshiram Manohar, 1970), pp. 38-39.

[84] 'Afīf, <u>Ta'rīkh</u>, pp. 373-79, 380, 382.

[85] Ibid., pp. 382-84.

[86] Ibid., pp. 379-81.

[87] Ibid., pp. 273-77.

[88] Ibid., p. 23.

[89] Ibid., pp. 170-72.

[90] Ibid., pp. 190-92.

[91] Ibid., p. 493.

[92] Ibid., pp. 472-73.

[93] Ibid., p. 50.

[94] Ibid., pp. 72-77.

[95] Ibid., pp. 432-33.

[96] Ibid., pp. 226-27.

[97] Ibid., pp. 406ff.

[98] Ibid., pp. 440-41.

[99] Ibid., pp. 254-60.

[100] Ibid., p. 23.

[101] Ibid., pp. 384-88.

[102] Ibid., p. 27.

[103] Ibid., pp. 184, 186, 195, 267, 269, 293, 294, 333.

[104] Ibid., p. 430.

105 Ibid., pp. 27-28.

106 Ibid., p. 313.

107 Ibid., p. 249.

108 Ibid., p. 243.

109 Ibid., pp. 166-67.

110 Ibid., pp. 314-15.

111 Ibid., pp. 497-98.

112 Ibid., p. 289. Actually, Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq spent thirteen days in the capital in the first seven years of his reign; Ibid., p. 399.

113 Ibid., pp. 265-66.

114 Ibid., p. 4.

115 Ibid., p. 1.

116 Ibid., pp. 419, 461.

117 Ibid., p. 319.

118 Ibid., p. 133.

119 Ibid., p. 263.

120 Ibid., p. 366.

121 Ibid., p. 287.

122 Ibid., pp. 378-79.

123 Ibid., pp. 382-84.

124 Ibid., pp. 165-66.

125 Ibid., pp. 306-7.

[126] Ibid., pp. 66-67.

[127] Ibid., pp. 185, 293.

[128] Ibid., pp. 426-28.

[129] Ibid., p. 272.

[130] Ibid., p. 133.

[131] Sarkar, "Personal History," p. 174.

[132] ʿAfīf, <u>Taʾrīkh</u>, pp. 50-51.

[133] Actually of Kay Kāʾūs, Ibid., p. 283.

[134] Actually compiled by Ḥamīd Qalandar, Ibid., p. 181.

[135] Ibid., pp. 293-94.

[136] Ibid., pp. 70, 73, 77, 78, 110, 185, 214, 261, 378.

[137] Ibid., pp. 127, 172, 398.

[138] Ibid., p. 40.

[139] Ibid., pp. 378, 379, 385, 386, 387, 469.

[140] Hardy, <u>Historians</u>, p. 55.

CONCLUSION

Two full decades have passed since Hardy was motivated to undertake his study of the historiography of the sultanate of Delhi because he felt that modern historians of medieval India tended to use medieval sources as 'authorities'. A great many histories have rolled off the printing presses since then, and not too many have heeded Hardy's exhortation to future researchers not to adopt a 'passive attitude' towards the information that the sources provide.[1] This thesis does not take issue with Hardy's basic premises and conclusions as laid out in the first and last chapters of his book. In fact it seeks partial justification in Hardy's conclusion that:

> The historian must aim, however much through limitations of his own capacities and sympathies he may fail, to gain insight into the mentality of people unlike himself as part of his endeavours to tell an intelligible story. As a beginning, and only as a beginning, he could do worse, in the field of medieval Indo-Muslim history, that study the mentality of Baranī and others for its own sake. The history of thought is not the whole history, but there is no intelligible history without it. (2)

Where the disagreement with Hardy arises is in the conclusions that he draws regarding the historians that he studies. These conclusions, it appears, are the result of studying the thought of the historians concerned for its 'own sake'. The work of no individual can be studied to any benefit or understood in any meaningful way by itself. The language that an individual speaks is the language that he has acquired from his environment. Through his language he consciously or unconsciously vocalises the thought of those whose interests and understanding of the world are similar to his own. The historian

himself is a part of history. Not only can the medieval histories help in understanding medieval history and politics, but also the histories cannot be understood without an understanding of medieval history and society. The relationship is a dialectical one. The understanding of medieval society is essential to understand the medieval sources from which we are supposed to learn about the medieval society. It is this aspect of placing the various historians and their histories in their proper environment that disagreements with Hardy's approach appear.

Every historian has a bee in his bonnet, as Carr puts it. "When you are reading a work of history, always listen out for the buzzing. If you can detect none, either you are tone deaf or your historian is a dull dog."[3] Hardy, when he listens for the buzzing, finds it in the religion that was common to the historians that he studied. What constantly surfaces in Hardy's analysis is that the nature of the histories and the outlook of the historians who wrote them were influenced primarily by one factor: Islam.[4]

That all these historians deal with the 'fortunes of the powerful and great only' according to Hardy is peculiar to their being Muslims. He says that in Muslim consciousness, the Sultan had taken over the role of protecting the faithful after the destruction of the caliphate in 1258. Hardy feels that the motivation which prompted the historians to write was their desire to "serve the cause of the religion, namely Islam."[5] With these premises in mind, Hardy's other conclusions fall into a familiar pattern:

1. That the historians were concerned only with Muslim destiny and

Muslim political achievement.

2. They accept the 'Muslim world order' and view the past through 'religious spectacles'.

3. That the Muslim historians whom he studied were 'recorders first and researchers a long way after', and for them an 'ounce of religious truth' weighed 'more than a pound of fact'.[6]

Hardy's conclusions may be right, but the logic by which he arrives at them is not very clear. To conclude that the historians dealt only with activities of the sultans because the sultan had replaced the Caliph in Muslim political consciousness is to presume that these historians lived, functioned and reacted on an abstract intellectual plane. Hardy mentions that the sultan had become the 'pivot of Muslim fortunes' but fails to amplify what these 'Muslim fortunes' consisted of. They included the material aspects of the society of which the sultan was the political head and to which these historians belonged. Baranī and ʻAfīf were not "wounded in their professional pride by writing about the deeds of men of the class to whom their patron, or expected patrons belonged",[7] only because of the rewards that they expected to receive. They wrote about that class because it was the only class that they were familiar with and to which they themselves (in the case of ʻAfīf, peripherally), belonged. It was only natural that "none of these historians would think of taking their meals in the kitchen", for "a festive table at court was their idea of a proper observation post for historians."[8] Such was the place in which they found themselves, and it was from that place that they observed history. By expecting his historians to be 'researchers' and behave like 'economic and social' historians, Hardy

is doing precisely what he accuses other historians of doing: of supposing that "..... Muslim historians of the Delhi Sultanate have assumed if not exactly the same, at least recognisably a similar mental world as the modern historian".[9] Elsewhere Hardy draws a parallel between medieval Muslim historians and British colonial historians:

> .... Muslim historians remained aloof within the 'civil lines' of Muslim historical writing imitating the modes and manners of Arabic and Persian historians back at 'home' in their own records of the adventures among the 'natives' of their fellow Indian Muslim political and military chiefs; they hoped that their histories would amuse, instruct and refresh those chiefs when they returned from weeks and months of hard campaigning in the '<u>mufassil</u>'. (10)

The vision of the three historians studied here was definitely limited to the activities of the nobles and rulers, but it was the result of the position from which they looked at the world around them. Their fortunes were inter-linked with the fortunes of those who wielded power, and they were, therefore, interested in the wielding of this power. It is not surprising that their histories should reflect what was happening to this class. For these historians, public affiars seemed to be run by a handful of individuals, and they understood and explained historical causation in terms of the actions of these few men. Such a view seems only natural in a society, simple in contrast to modern times, where the social inter-dependence of social units was less developed due to less developed technology.

The role of religion in the thinking of these historians has to be seen in a similar context. All products of an education that was basically defined in a religious framework, these historians had to use the terminology and concepts familiar to them. Religion was the only ideology known to them, and they interpreted everything according to it.

Religious sanctions were the only legal sanctions available for authority, political or otherwise. It would have been surprising had these historians not resorted to religious authority as the most convenient way of deciding what information they would pass on to their readers. By mentioning that their informants were 'trust-worthy' or 'God fearing' or 'good Muslims' they certify the authenticity of the facts that they had accepted and then mentioned in their histories. But nowhere do they state what constitutes the religious reliability of their informants or other sources of information. Very much like their counterparts in the political field, they found religion a useful cliché to make whatever they said or did a little more acceptable.

Similarly, what Hardy terms their belief in the 'Muslim world order' is totally undefinable in specifically Islamic terms. The 'Muslim world order' that they believed in could equally easily be characterised as the 'medieval world order'. Belief in a strong political authority, that was capable of maintaining law and order, repelling invasions, and offering a semblance of justice (justice being synonymous with not being excessively oppressive) was not peculiar only to medieval Muslim political thinkers. Rebellion or any other defiance of political authority was never accepted unless it was successful at which time it assumed legitimacy. This acceptance of former rebels as legitimate political authority was not difficult because rebellions only re-defined the power equations among the various cliques within the ruling class. The Muslim world order that these historians believed in was their view of how things should be for the privileged class to which they belonged. Belief in the privileges of one minute section of a population is not limited to

Muslims. To say that a historian such as Baranī was interested in the fortunes of all the Muslims would be patently untrue. He was concerned only with Muslims of one particular class.

The histories of Minhāj, Baranī and 'Afīf are histories of the governing class, and it is with this in mind that they have to be used. The individual positions of these individuals within the governing class might have been different. The nature and composition of this governing class might have differed from time to time, but its preoccupations and concerns stayed the same: the rulers strove to strengthen their hold over power and to wield it for maximum benefit for themselves. The ruling class of which Minhāj was a part was primarily concerned with digging its feet in. Hence his concern with the mechanics of this process and his obsessive concern with the military or political commanders involved in this process. By the time Baranī wrote, this class had established itself and had become larger during the process of consolidation of its power. Having indiscriminately fattened itself off the spoils, it was faced with the inevitable strifes and tensions generated within itself. Baranī's thought and work reflects these tensions. 'Afīf had seen the political structure which supported this class collapse; hence his nostalgia for a lost golden age.

Placed at specific points of historical evolution, these historians were the products of their times. Minhāj had not been born in India but had witnessed the world in which he grew up traumatised by the activities of the 'infidel' Mongols. For him, the fortunes of the Muslim community were one; the separate identity of the sultanate of Delhi had yet to be defined, and for him the Delhi sultanate was the only place for

refuge for central Asian Muslims. The politics of Minhāj's time were the politics of survival, of one military campaign after another, of the suppression of one insurrection after another. He does not notice anything that is not connected with this basic concern. He travelled extensively in India, but he does not deem it necessary to mention any customs or sights that must have seemed strange to his foreign eyes.

Baranī had seen the Delhi sultanate take shape. He had heard about the centralisation of power by Balban from his forbears. He had himself seen the administrative machinery of the state being set up by ʿAlā'al-Dīn. Under Muḥammad ibn Tughlaq he had seen the surfacing of the inevitable problems to which feudally based power is susceptible. He had to find reason for the particular shape that historical evolution had taken and of which he had personally been a victim. His vison being predefined by his position within the miniscule tip of the social and political pyramid, he had to find reasons for the change in history in the activities of the others of his class. The role of an individual in history is limited. But in a monarchical political system it does assume real or imaginary significance. Faced with political decay, Baranī blamed the sultans for it. The symptoms of the problem as they appeared in the reign of Muḥammad ibn Tughlaq were taken as causes of the decay. Muḥammad ibn Tughlaq's radical and desperate administrative measures, his attempts at consolidation of the empire by using ṣūfīs as agents of the process and his last ditch attempts to add revenues to the treasury by his schemes of further conquest were for Baranī the real reason for the decline of the sultanate. Baranī, with hindsight, attempted to define a political theory for the sultanate which could have saved the empire.

But in reality this political theory only reflected the narrow-mindedness and the limitations of vision that had brought on the problems in the first place. What Baranī was actually propounding was a blue-print to save the power of his section within the ruling class. In short, his work was a plea to keep those whom he considered as outsiders away from the privileges. The more people there were to share these privileges, the fewer privileges there were to go around. Baranī was just one of the first victims of the class who would lose their power and prestige with the political and military decline of the sultanate. Not in a position to perceive this, he found the reasons for his own misfortunes and for the troubles of the sultanate in the process of assimilation of those, who according to him, had no right to be a part of the governing class, whether they were the 'low-born' or non-Muslims. Unable to see the reality, Baranī treated his history as the story of misfortunes that arose from factors such as ʻAlā'al-Dīn's irreligiosity or Muḥāmmad ibn Tughlaq fondness for philosophers and rationalists. Baranī's attitude mirrors the failures of the rulers to understand the real problems facing the sultanate, i.e. the consumptive greed of the nobility once it thought it was secure enough not to worry about sticking together.

ʻAfīf, writing after the weakening of the political structure of the sultanate had made it a passive victim to the forces of an invader shows neither the optimism of Minhāj nor the paranoia of Baranī. The process of destuction had been completed. Arrogance or anger was no longer possible. Nostalgia, which must have come easy to a class which had lost everything and which had little to look forward to, is the predominant element in ʻAfīf's work. And ʻAfīf must not have been the only

one who looked back and saw an age when everything was perfect; when things were cheap; when there was peace and security; and when a benevolent king, who was a saint, ruled.

Minhāj was a high functionary of the state. Baranī was not as important during his own lifetime, but he had inherited a position close to the court. 'Afīf most probably was a minor official. But all had one thing in common: their fortunes were intertwined with the survival and prosperity of the sultanate. Each witnessed the evolution of the sultanate at different points and from different vantage positions. This thesis has been an attempt to study the three historians and their histories in relation to the environment of which they were products. The only conclusion to be safely drawn is that only through greater knowledge of the historical forces which molded the socio-political attitude of these historians, can their histories be properly utilised.

NOTES

[1]Peter Hardy, Historians of Medieval India: Studies in Indo-Muslim Historical Writing (London: Luzac & Co., 1960), p. 122.

[2]Ibid., p. 131.

[3]E. H. Carr, What is History? (London: Macmillan, 1961, reprint ed., Pelican Books, 1976), p. 23.

[4]Or conversely, one could try and hear the buzzing in Hardy's bonnet. He is acutely conscious that the "earlier enthusiasm for the religion and culture of India, still less of Muslim India .... among British scholars" was waning. This lack of interest on the part of British scholars, according to Hardy, is a direct contrast to scholars of other nationalities: "It was left to the American Murray Titus, or the White Russian, W. Ivanow, or the German, Herman Goetz, among Europeans, to carry on the earlier traditions." Hardy also notices the failure of historians, like H. Dodwell, W. H. Moreland, and T. G. P. Spear to throw "much light upon the nature and the course of Muslim religious and cultural activity in medieval India", and the general "divorce of the Muslim part of the history of medieval India from the study of Islam as a religion and as a system of thought in its wider extra-Indian setting." See Hardy, Historians, pp. 3-5. Having formulated these very valid criticisms, and wanting to rectify the neglect of these aspects of other British historians, Hardy goes to the other extreme of trying to interpret the works of the medieval Muslim historians as being influenced primarily by their religion.

[5]Hardy, Historians, p. 113.

[6]Ibid., pp. 114-15, 120.

[7]Ibid., p. 112.

[8]Ibid., p. 111.

[9]Peter Hardy, "The Muslim Historians of the Delhi Sultanate: Is What they say really What they Mean?" Journal of the Asiatic Society of Pakistan, 9 (1964): 194.

[10]Peter Hardy, "Some Studies in Pre-Mughal Historiography," Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon, ed. C. H. Philips (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), p. 115.

APPENDIX A

The Sultans of Delhi

Chronology*

602-790/1206-1388

Mu'izzī or Slave Kings

602/1206	Quṭb al-Dīn Aybak
607/1210	Ārām Shāh
607/1211	Shams al-Dīn Iltutmish
633/1236	Rukn al-Dīn Fīrūz Shāh
634/1236	Radiyyah
637/1240	Mu'izz al-Dīn Bahrām Shāh
639/1242	'Alā' al-Dīn Mas'ūd Shāh
644/1246	Nāṣir al-Dīn Maḥmūd Shāh
664/1266	Ghiyāth al-Dīn Balban
686/1287	Mu'izz al-Dīn Kayqubād

Khaljīs

689/1290	Jalāl al-Dīn Khaljī
695/1296	'Alā' al-Dīn Khaljī
716/1316	Quṭb al-Dīn Mubārak Khaljī

Tughlaqs

720/1320	Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughlaq
725/1325	Muḥammad ibn Tughlaq
752/1351	Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq

*Based on, Clifford E. Bosworth, The Islamic Dynasties: A Chronological and Genealogical Handbook, Islamic Surveys 5 (Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1967.

APPENDIX B

Institute of Islamic Studies
McGill University

TRANSLITERATION TABLE

Consonants: ء initial: unexpressed ء medial and final: ʼ

	Arabic	Persian	Turkish	Urdu		Arabic	Persian	Turkish	Urdu
ب	b	b	b	b	ص	ṣ	ṣ	ṣ	ṣ
پ		p	p	p	ض	ḍ	z̤	z̤	z̤
ت	t	t	t	t	ط	ṭ	ṭ	ṭ	ṭ
ٹ				ṭ	ظ	ẓ	ẓ	ẓ	ẓ
ث	th	s̱	s̱	s̱	ع	ʻ	ʻ	ʻ	ʻ
ج	j	j	c	j	غ	gh	gh	ğ	g̲h̲
چ		ch	ç	ch	ف	f	f	f	f
ح	ḥ	ḥ	ḥ	ḥ	ق	q	q	ḳ	q
خ	kh	kh	h̲	k̲h̲	ك	k	k	k	k
د	d	d	d	d	گ		g	g	g
ڈ				ḍ	ڭ			ñ	
ذ	dh	z̲	z̲	z̲	ل	l	l	l	l
ر	r	r	r	r	م	m	m	m	m
ڑ				ṛ	ن	n	n	n	n
ز	z	z	z	z	ں				ṇ
ژ		zh	zh	zh	ه	h	h	h	h
س	s	s	s	s	و	w	v	v	v
ش	sh	sh	ş	sh	ی	y	y	y	y

Vowels, diphthongs, etc. (For Ottoman Turkish vowels etc. see separate memorandum.)

short: ـَ a; ـِ i; ـُ u.

long: ا ā; و ū, and in Persian and Urdu also rendered ō; ي ī, and in Urdu also rendered by ē; ے (in Urdu) ō.

alif maqṣūrah: ىٰ á.

diphthongs: ـَيْ ay; ـَوْ aw.

long with tashdīd: ـِيّ īya; ـُوّ ūwa.

tā' marbūṭah: ة ah; in iḍāfah: at.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

ORIGINAL SOURCES

ʻAfīf Shams-i Sirāj. Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī. Edited by Maulvi Vilayat Husain. Bibliotheca Indica Series. Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1891.

Baranī, Ḍiyā' al-Dīn. Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī. Edited by Saiyid Ahmad Khan. Bibliotheca Indica Series. Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1862.

________. Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī. Edited by Afsar Salim Khan. Lahore: University of Panjab, 1972.

Jūzjānī, Minhāj-i Sirāj. Tabaqāt-i Nāṣirī. Edited by W. Nassau Lees, Khadim Hosain and Abdal Hai. Bibliotheca Indica Series. Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1864.

________. Tabaqāt-i Nāṣirī. Edited by Abdal Hai Qandhar. 2 vols. Vol. 1: Quetta, n.p., 1949. Vol. 2: Lahore: University of Panjab, 1954.

Kirmānī, Muḥammad ibn Mubārak. Siyar al-Awliyā'. Delhi: n.p., 1302/1885.

Translations:

ʻAlī, Muḥammad Fidā. Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī of Shams-i Sirāj ʻAfīf. Karach: Nafīs Academy, 1962.

Colvin, Auckland. "Translations from the Tarikh i Firuzshahi by Ziauddin of Baran.... The Reign of Sultan Ghiasuddin Tughlaq Shah." Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 40, i (1871): 217-47.

Elliot, Henry M. and Dowson, John. The History of India as Told by its Own Historians. Vols. 1-3: London: Trübner & Co., 1869-71.

Fuller, A. R. "Translations from the Tārīkh i Fīrūz Shāhī.... The Reign of Alauddin i Khilji." Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 38, i (1869): 181-220; 39, ii (1870): 1-51.

Habib, Mohammad and Khan, Afsar Umar Salim. Political Theory of the Delhi Sultante: Including a translation of Ziauddin Barani's Fatawa-i Jahandari. Allahabad: Kitab Mahal, n.d.

Haq, S. Moinul. Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī of Ḍiyā' al-Dīn Baranī. Lahore: Markazī Urdu Board, 1969.

Raverty, H. G. Ṭabakāt-i Nāsirī: A General History of the Muhammadan Dynasties of Asia, Including Hindustan and the Irruption of the Infidel Mughals into Islam. 2 vols. Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1881, reprint ed., New Delhi: Oriental Books Reprint Corporation, 1970.

Rizvi, Saiyid Athar Abbas. A Source Book of Medieval Indian History in Hindi. 10 vols. Aligarh: Department of History, Aligarh Muslim University, 1953-62. Vol. 2: Ādī Turk Kālīn Bhārat. Vol. 3: Khaljī Kālīn Bhārat. Vol. 4: Tughlaq Kālīn Bhārat, I. Vol. 5: Tughlaq Kālīn Bhārat, II.

Whalley, P. "Translations from the Tārīkh i Fīrūzshāhī.... The Reign of Mu'izz-uddin." Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 40, i (1871): 185-216.

SECONDARY SOURCES*

Ahmad, Aziz. An Intellectual History of Islam in India. Islamic Surveys 7. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1969.

________. "The Role of Ulema in Indo-Muslim History." Studia Islamica, 31 (1970): 1-13.

________. "The Sufi and Sultan in pre-Mughal India." Der Islam, 38 (1962): 142-53.

________. "Trends in Political Thought of Medieval Muslim India." Studia Islamica, 17 (1962): 121-30.

Akhter, Mohammad Saleem. "A Critical Appraisal of the Sufi Hagiographical Corpus of Medieval India." Islamic Culture, 42 (1978): 139-50.

Ansari, A. S. Bazmee. "Bulandshahr." EI^2: 1339-40.

________. "al-Djūzdjānī." EI^2: 609.

Ashraf, Kunwar Muhammad. Life and Conditions of the People of Hindustan. 2d ed. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1970.

*Articles, when included in a volume along with other articles of the same author, have not been cited independently here though full references have been given in the notes.

Askari, Syed Hasan. "Amir Khusrau as a Historian." In Historians of Medieval India, pp. 22-36. Edited by Muhibbul Hasan with a Foreword by Muhammad Mujeeb. Meerut: Meenakshi Prakashan, 1968.

________. "Historical Value of the Sufi Hagiographical Works of the Sultanate Period." Journal of the Bihar Research Society, 52 (1966): 142-84.

Banerjee, A. C. "Kingship and Nobility in the Thirteenth Century." Indian Historical Quarterly, 11 (1935): 223-40.

Banerjee, Jamini Mohan. History of Firuz Shah Tughlaq. Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1967.

Barani, S. H. "Ziauddin Barani." Islamic Culture, 12 (1938): 76-97.

Barthold, V. V. Turkestan Down to the Mongol Invasions. Translated and revised from Russian by the author with assistance from H. A. R. Gibb. London: Luzac & Co., 1928.

Bosworth, Clifford E. The Islamic Dynasties: A Chronological and Genealogical Handbook. Islamic Surveys 5. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1967.

________. "Mahmud of Ghazna in Contemporary Eyes and in Later Persian Literature." Iran, 4 (1966): 85-92.

Boyle, J. A. "The Mongol Commanders in Afghanistan and India according to the Tabaqāt-i Nāsirī of Jūzjānī." Islamic Studies, 2 (1963): 235-47.

Brown, Percy. Indian Architecture. 2d ed., rev. and enl. Bombay: Taraporevala Sons & Co., Td., n.d.

Carr, E. H. What is History? London: Macmillan, 1961. Reprint ed., Pelican Books, 1976.

Day, U. N. Administrative System of the Delhi Sultanate. Allahabad: Kitab Mahal, 1965.

________. The Government of the Sultanate. New Delhi: Kumar Brothers, 1972.

________. Some Aspects of Medieval Indian History. New Delhi: Kumar Brothers, 1971.

de Bary, Wm. Theodore, ed. Sources of Indian Tradition. New York: Columbia University Press, 1960.

Elliot, Henry M. and Dowson, John. The History of India as Told by its Own Historians. 8 vols. London: Trubner & Co., 1867-77. Calcutta: Susil Gupta, 1952-58.

Ethé, Herman. Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the India Office Library. 2 vols. Oxford: India Office, 1903-37.

Goitein, S. D. "The Muslim Government as seen by its Non-Muslim Subjects." Journal of the Pakistan Historical Society, 12 (1964): 1-13.

Habib, Mohammad. Politics and Society in the Early Medieval Period. Edited by Khaliq Ahmad Nizami. New Delhi: Peoples Publishing House, 1974.

Habib, Mohammad and Khan, Afsar Umar Salim. The Political Theory of the Delhi Sultanate: Including a translation of Ziauddin Barani's Fatawa-i Jahandari. Allahabad: Kitab Mahal, n.d.

Habibullah, A. B. M. The Foundation of Muslim Rule in India. Allahabad: Central Book Depot, 1961.

________. "Provincial Government under the Mameluke Sultans of Delhi." Indian Historical Quarterly, 19 (1943): 252-62.

________. "Re-evaluation of the Literary Sources of Pre-Mughal History." Islamic Culture, 15 (1941): 207-16.

Hambly, Gavin. "Who were the Chihilgānī, the Forty Slaves of Sultān Shams al-Dīn Iltutmish of Delhi?" Iran, 10 (1972): 57-62.

Haq, S. Moinul. Barani's History of the Tughlaqs: Being a Critical Study of the Relevant Chapters of the Tārīkh i Fīrūz Shāhī. Karachi: Pakistan Historical Society, 1959.

Hardy, Peter. "Baranī." EI^{2}: 1067-68.

________. Historians of Medieval India: Studies in Indo-Muslim Historical Writing. London: Luzac & Co., 1960.

________. "Islam in Medieval India." In Sources of Indian Tradition, pp. 367-528. Edited by Wm. Theodore de Bary. New York: Columbia University Press, 1960.

________. "Mahmud of Ghazna and the Historians." Journal of the Punjab University Historical Society, 14 (1962): 1-36.

________. "The Muslim Historians of the Delhi Sultanate: Is What they say really What they Mean?" Journal of the Asiatic Society of Pakistan, 9 (1964): 59-63.

______. "The Oratio-Recta of Baranī's Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī -- Fact or Fiction?" Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies. 20 (1950): 315-21.

______. "Some Studies in Pre-Mughal Muslim Historiography." In Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon, pp. 115-27. Edited by C. H. Philips. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.

______. "The Treatment of Violence in Indo-Muslim Persian Writings on History and Polity." Paper presented at the Conference on Islam in South Asia, Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University, Montréal, 1978.

______. "Unity and Variety in Indo-Islamic and Perso-Islamic Cvilisations: Some Ethical and Political Ideas of Ḍiyā' al-Dīn Baranī of Delhi, of al-Ghazālī and of Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūṣī Compared." Iran, 16 (1978): 127-37.

Hasan, Mohibbul, ed. Historians of Medieval India. With a Foreword by Muhammad Mujeeb. Meerut: Meenakshi Prakashan, 1968.

Hasan, S. Nurul. "Sahifa-i-Na't-i-Muhammadi of Zia-ud-Din Barani." Medieval India Quarterly, 1, iii and iv (1950): 100-106.

Hodgson, Marshall G. S. "The Unity of Later Islamic History." Journal of World History, 5 (1960): 879-914.

Hodivālā, Shāhpūrshāh Homasjī. Studies in Indo-Muslim History: A Critical Commentary on Elliot and Dowson's History of India as Told by its Own Historians. With a Foreword by Richard Burns. Vol. 1: Bombay, S. H. Hodivālā, 1939. Supplement, vol. 2: Bombay, R. S. Hodivālā, 1957. Volume 2 has imprint, Bombay: Distributors, Popular Book Depot.

Husain, Agha Mahdi. "A Critical Study of the Sources for the History of India." Islamic Culture, 31 (1957): 314-21.

______. Tughlaq Dynasty. Rev. and enl. ed. of Rise and Fall of Muhammad bin Tughlaq. Calcutta: Thacker, Spink & Co. Pvt. Ltd., 1963.

Indian History Congress. A Comprehensive History of India. 12 vols. Vol. 5: The Delhi Sultanate. Edited by Mohammad Habib and Khaliq Ahmad Nizami. New Delhi: Peoples Publishing House, 1970.

Islam, Riazul. "A Note on Sirat-i Firuz Shahi." Proceedings of the Pakistan History Conference, 2 (1952): 245-49.

Jauhari, R. C. Firoz Tughlaq. Agra: Shiva Lal Agarwala & Co., 1968.

Lal, Kishori Saran. History of the Khaljis. Allahabad: Asia Publishing House, 1950.

_______. Muslim State in India. Allahabad: Vichar Prakashan, 1950.

_______. Studies in Medieval Indian History. Delhi: Ranjit Printers and Publishers, 1966.

Lambton, Ann K. S. Islamic Society in Persia. Inaugural Lecture, School of Oriental and African Studies, London: 9th March, 1954.

Lees, W. Nassau. "Materials for the History of India for the Six Hundred Year of Muhammadan Rule previous to the Foundation of the British Indian Empire." Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, n.s., iii (1867-68): 141-75.

Majumdar, R.C., gen. ed., The History and Culture of the Indian People. 12 vols. Bombay: Bhartiya Vidya Bhavan, 1951-66. Vol. 5: The Struggle for Empire. Vol. 6: The Delhi Sultanate.

Mirza, M. Wahid. The Life and Works of Amir Khusrau. Calcutta, 1935; reprint ed., Lahore: University of Panjab, 1962.

Moreland, W. H. Agrarian System of Moslem India. 2d ed. Delhi: Oriental Books Reprint Corporation, 1968.

Mujeeb, Muhammad. The Indian Muslims. Montréal: McGill University Press, 1967.

Mukhia, Harbans. Historians and Historiography During the Reign of Akbar. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., 1976.

Nigam, S. P. B. "Administrative Training of the Nobility under the Sultans of Delhi (1206-1398)." Islamic Culture, 41 (1967): 87-91.

_______. Nobility under the Sultans of Delhi, A.D. 1206-1398. Delhi: Munshiram Mahoharlal, 1968.

Nizami, Khaliq Ahmad. "The Early Turkish Sultans of Delhi." In A Comprehensive History of India. Vol. 5: The Delhi Sultanate, pp. 191-208. Edited by Mohammad Habib and Khaliq Ahmad Nizami. New Delhi: Peoples Publishing House, 1970.

_______. "Iltutmish the Mystic." Islamic Culture, 20 (1946): 165-80.

_______. The Life and Times of Shaikh Farid-u'd Din Ganj-i Shakar. Aligarh: Department of History, Aligarh Muslim University, 1955.

_______. Salāṭīn-i Dihlī ke Madhhabī Rujhānāt. Delhi: Nadwat al-Muṣanni fīn, 1958.

_______. Some Aspects of Religion and Politics in India during the Thirteenth Century. 2d ed. Delhi: Idarah-i Adabiyat-i Delli, 1974.

_______. Studies in Medieval Indian History and Culture. Allahabad: Kitab Mahal, 1966.

_______. "Sulṭān 'Alā' al-Dīn ke Madhhabī Ruyhanāt." Burhān, 21, v (1948): 201-40; 21, vi (1948): 261-89.

_______. "Zia-ud-Din Barani." In Historians of Medieval India, pp. 37-52. Edited by Mohibbul Hasan with a Foreword by Muhammad Mujeeb. Meerut: Meenakshi Prakashan, 1968.

Philips, C. H. Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Qureshi, Ishtiaq Husain. Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi. 5th ed., rev. Delhi: Oriental Books Reprint Corporation, 1971.

_______. "Muslim India before the Mughuls." In Cambridge History of Islam. Vol. 2, pp. 3-34. Edited by P.M. Holt, A. K. S. Lambton and Bernard Lewis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Rashīd, Shaykh 'Abd al-. Khwājah Diyā' al-Millat al-Dīn Dīyā' al-Dīn Barnī. Translated by Muhammad 'Umar. Aligarh: Department of History, Aligarh Muslim University, 1957.

Rizvi, Saiyid Athar Abbas. History of Sufism. Vol. 1: New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd.

_______. A Source Book for Medieval Indian History in Hindi. 10 vols. Aligarh: Department of History, Aligarh Muslim University, 1953-62.

Rosenthal, Franz. A History of Muslim Historiography. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968.

Roy, N. B. "Futuhat-i Firuz Shah." Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, ser. iii, 7 (1941): 61-89.

Saksena, Banarsi Prasad. "Firuz Shah Tughlaq." In Comprehensive History of India. Vol. 5: The Delhi Sultanate, pp. 566-619. Edited by Mohammad Habib and Khaliq Ahmad Nizami. New Delhi: Peoples Publishing House, 1970.

Saran, Paramatma. Studies in Medieval Indian History. Hyderabad, Deccan: Apex, 1964.

Sarkar, Jagadish Narayan. "Historical Biography in Persian in Medieval India." Indo-Iranica, 29, i-iv (1929): 29-56.

_______. History of History Writing in Medieval India. Calcutta: Ratna Prakashan, 1978.

_______. "Personal History of Some Medieval Historians and their Writings." In Historians of Medieval India, pp. 165-74. Edited by Mohibbul Hasan with a Foreword by Muhammad Mujeeb. Meerut: Meenakshi Prakashan, 1968.

Sen, Asit Kumar. People and Politics in Early Medieval India. Calcutta: Indian Book Distriubtion Co., 1963.

Srivastava, A. L. Mughal Empire. Agra: Shiva Lal Agarwala & Co. Ltd., 1964.

Storey, C. A. Persian Literature: A Bio-Bibliographical Survey. 2 vols. London: The Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, 1927-29, reprint ed., 1970.

Tripathi, R. P. Some Aspects of Muslim Administration. Allahabad: Central Book Depot, 1959.

Wright, H. Nelson. Coinage and Meteorology of the Sultans of Delhi. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936.